DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 247 878 HE 017 704

AUTHOR Nason, John W.
TITLE Presidential Assessment: A Guide to the Periodic Review of the Performance of Chief Executives.
INSTITUTION Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY Kellogg Foundation, Battle Creek, Mich.
PUB DATE Jun 84
NOTE 116p.; Revision of 1980 publication. For related documents, see HE 017 703-705.
AVAILABLE FROM Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, One Dupont Circle, Suite 400, Washington, DC 20036 ($16.00 nonmembers; $12.00 members).
PUB TYPE Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Evaluation; Church Related Colleges; *College Administration; *College Presidents; *Evaluation Criteria; Evaluation Methods; Evaluation Needs; Governance; Guidelines; Higher Education; Letters (Correspondence); Private Colleges; Questionnaires; Rating Scales; Self Evaluation (Individuals); State Colleges

ABSTRACT

Guidelines for the review of the performance of college presidents are presented. After a review of pressures for more formal appraisals of presidents, the method and purpose of the evaluation are discussed. Major purposes include the following: to strengthen the president's position and improve performance, to review and improve the governance of the institution, and to educate trustees, faculty, and others on the president's role. The choice of methods depends on the purposes envisaged by president and board, and on the institutional context. The advantages and disadvantages of formal versus informal evaluations are examined, and actual procedures that have been used at colleges are described. The procedures vary widely, depending on the nature of the governing board, the type and complexity of the institution, and the climate of the campus. Discussions of presidential self-assessment and assessment by other constituencies are followed by a summary chapter which provides a concise overview of the issue in the form of 11 highlights of the assessment process. Six necessary ingredients for conducting a proper assessment are also described. addressed. Appendices include evaluation guidelines for a large private university, a small church-related college, and three state institutions; and letters, questionnaires, and rating scales. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED247787

PRESIDENTIAL ASSESSMENT

A Guide to the Periodic Review of the Performance of Chief Executives

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AGB

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

John W. Nason

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges

NE 017 704

By John W. Nason
Assisted By Nancy R. Axelrod

Association of Governing Boards of
Universities and Colleges
One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036
202/296-8400

Copyright © 1980, 1984
Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges

Contents

Foreword v
Preface viii

Chapter 1: Old Wine in New Bottles: The Growing Concern for Evaluation 1
Some Empirical Data 2
Reasons for Increased Concern 3
Managing "Organized Anarchies": The President's Job 4
"Physician, Heal Thyself" 6

Chapter 2: Evaluation—For What Purpose? 9
Purposes of Evaluation 9
Choice of Methods 12
Example A—General Purposes of the Evaluation of the President *(from guidelines used by a Canadian university)* 14
Example B—Presidential Evaluation: Objectives *(used by a southern state university)* 14

Chapter 3: Formal vs. Informal Evaluations 17
Advantages of Formal Evaluation 17
Disadvantages of Formal Evaluation 19
Advantages of Informal Evaluation 21
Disadvantages of Informal Evaluation 22
The Ideal Design 23

Chapter 4: The Ingredients for a Good Mix 27
The Attitude of the Trustees 27
Differences of Institutional Type 28
The Temper of the Campus 29

Chapter 5: Necessary and Desirable Components 31

Chapter 6: The Choice and Use of Criteria 35
Importance of Prior Agreement 36
Choice of Criteria 37
Example A – Criteria for Evaluation Used by a Private College 39
Example B – Criteria for Evaluation Used by a City University 40

Chapter 7: The President's Self-Assessment 43
Reasons for Self-Assessment 43
What Self-Assessment Should Include 44

Chapter 8: How Others View the President 47
Sources of Evidence 47
Pros and Cons of Polling 48
Techniques of Inquiry 49
The Use of Consultant(s) 52

Chapter 9: First and Last Thoughts: Summary and Conclusions 57
The Highlights of Assessment 57
Conclusions and Recommendations 62

Appendix A: A Spectrum of Examples 67
The Casual Approach 67
Informal But Planned 68
Formal or Informal? Borderline Cases 69
Full-Dress Evaluations 71

Appendix B: Guidelines Used for Presidential Evaluations 83
At a Large Private University 83
At a Small Church-Related College 84
At Stockton State College 87
At State University of New York 88
Public Announcement by Montclair State Board of Trustees following Presidential Evaluation 91

Appendix C: Letters, Questionnaires and Rating Scales 93
Letter from Committee Member of a Private College Inviting Faculty Participation 93
Letter from Committee Member of a Private College Inviting Staff Participation 95
Generalized Evaluation Instrument Used at a Midwestern Church-Related College 96
Detailed Questionnaire Used by Western Private College 97
Rating Scale Used by Committee at a State University System 101
Two Rating Scales Developed for Community College Presidents 104/105

Foreword

The Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB) is pleased to offer this publication in response to the many board members and presidents who have sought guidance on a delicate and controversial subject — the review of presidential performance.

Because there are many different ways to assess presidential performance, this report has been designed in such a manner as to allow each board to develop procedures which are sensitive and appropriate to its institutional needs and circumstances. However, we encourage all boards to consider carefully the motives for such a process and to acknowledge the importance of examining institutional leadership as a whole.

As John Nason cautions, a program of presidential assessment should not be conducted as a basis for making a decision to retain or not retain the president or chancellor. Furthermore, AGB urges boards to assess their own performance at the same time that they choose to review the president's. (Procedural guidelines and criteria for self-study by boards of trustees are available from AGB[1]).

We are once again indebted to Dr. John W. Nason for devoting his energy, his experience, and his special knowledge to yet another major contribution to the improvement of academic governance. His insight as a former president, trustee, and educator was energetically and effectively channeled into his role as director of the Study of Presidential Selection and Assessment.

Nancy R. Axelrod, vice president for programs and public policy at AGB, served as assistant director for this study. We acknowledge with appreciation her own significant contribution to the successful outcome of this project.

At the end of this Foreword is listed a

remarkable group of trustees, presidents, and other educators who served on the Advisory Board for the Study of Presidential Selection and Assessment. Their diverse institutional experience and their commitment to the improvement of postsecondary education lent depth and perspective to this study.

This report, a sequel to *Presidential Search: A Guide to the Process of Selecting & Appointing College and University Presidents*, completes the second major AGB project on governance[1] that has been supported by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation of Battle Creek, Michigan. We are grateful to the Foundation and to its program officer, Dr. Arlon E. Elser, for making this timely project possible.

The eighties are not likely to be a comfortable time for presidents or trustees. In the challenging decade ahead, we hope that thoughtful and equitable assessment procedures will help keep good men and women in, and attract qualified persons to, the presidency. We trust that this publication will serve to strengthen the beleaguered presidency, to maintain or improve relations between the president and his or her board, and to help trustees to contend effectively with their own difficult responsibilities.

Robert L. Gale
President
June 1984

1. *Self Study Criteria* are available for Community College Governing Boards, Independent College and University Governing Boards, Public College and University Governing Boards, Governing Boards of Public Higher Education Systems, and Boards of State Postsecondary Education Planning and Coordinating Agencies.

2. The W. K. Kellogg Foundation also provided the funds to support a project undertaken jointly by AGB and the National Association of College and University Business Officers, *Financial Responsibilities of Governing Boards of Colleges and Universities*.

Advisory Board Members*

Howard R. Bowen
Member, Board of Fellows
Claremont University Center

Merrimon Cunninggim
President, Salem College

Charles F. Fisher
Director, Institute for College and University Administrators, American Council on Education

James F. Gollattscheck
President, Valencia Community College

George Janik
Chairman, Board of Trustees, Kent State University

David F. Johnson
Trustee, Prince George's Community College

Clark Kerr
Member, Board of Managers
Swarthmore College

Walter J. Leonard
President, Fisk University

Richard W. Lyman
President, Stanford University

Wenda Moore
Chairman, Board of Regents, University of Minnesota

Rev. Msgr. John F. Murphy
Executive Director, College and University Department, National Catholic Educational Association

Frank Newman
President, University of Rhode Island

Charles Pelfry
Faculty Regent,
Morehead State University

James A. Perkins
Chairman, International Council on Educational Development

Sidney A. Rand
President, Saint Olaf College

Elden T. Smith
Director, Presidential Search Consultation Service, Association of American Colleges

Sid R. Thomas
Student Regent, Montana University System

Mary St. John Villard
Chairman, Board of Trustees, Vassar College

Barry Munitz
Consultant, Chancellor, University of Houston

* Since this project was completed the affiliations of some of the Advisory Board have changed.

Preface

This is the second of two studies on college and university presidents produced under the aegis of the Association of Governing Boards. The first was on the selection and appointment of presidents.[1] This sequel, first published in 1980, examines the procedures that are currently being used to assess presidential performance. The present edition has been only slightly revised. Apart from minor editorial improvements, the only significant change in emphasis is increased concern over the negative consequences of formal and public assessments and therefore over the suitability of such procedures.

The new demands on college and university presidents, the increased concern and involvement on the part of regents and trustees, the changing nature of postsecondary education have drawn attention to questions of performance and accountability. Governing boards are more conscious of their responsibility to make certain that the institutions under their control are being well managed. Some boards are uneasy because they are not sure how to proceed; others are experimenting with a variety of procedures — some good and some counterproductive. The present volume is an attempt to assess the relative merits of different programs and to provide guidelines for sound practice.

The Table of Contents with its subheadings should enable the reader to identify the discussion of issues in which he or she is primarily interested. Those who want a

short treatment of the whole process will find both summary and recommendations in Chapter 9. The Appendices contain illustrative examples of letters, questionnaires and procedures used in different types of assessment and by different kinds of institution.

Throughout the two years devoted to these studies I enjoyed the help and guidance of a national advisory board composed of distinguished, diverse and concerned individuals. Their always interesting and conflicting reactions to early drafts have not made my life easier, but have made the final product much better. None of them would agree with all the statements in the text.

Barry Munitz, former chancellor of the Central Campus of the University of Houston and the most experienced consultant in the field of presidential evaluation, served as special consultant to the study. Generous with his time and knowledge, he added depth and perspective to the analysis here presented.

This study, like its predecessor, would not have possible without the constant collaboration of Nancy R. Axelrod, AGB's vice president for programs and public policy. As assistant director, she carried the brunt of the research with patience, humor, and high intelligence. A more pleasant and efficient colleague could not be found. I am also grateful for the constant and cheerful services of the AGB staff.

If this and the companion volume prove of some use to governing boards in the selection and assessment of their chief executive officers, they should thank the W. K. Kellogg Foundation and its program director, Arlon E. Elser, who provided both moral and financial encouragement. It is one more gold star in the Foundation's more than fifty years of service to mankind and to the cause of education.

John W. Nason
Keene, N.Y.
October 1983

1. John W. Nason, *Presidential Search: A Guide to the Process of Selecting and Appointing College and University Presidents* (Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards, 1979).

Chapter 1

Old Wine in New Bottles: The Growing Concern for Evaluation

College and university presidents live in the public domain. No matter what the size or complexity or status, public or private, of the institution, the president's decisions (or indecisions) affect its well-being and the lives of those who make up the educational community. Those decisions are under continuous scrutiny and are met with approval or disapproval, often with both and rarely with indifference. Faculty, students, trustees, staff, alumni, donors, state education officers, legislators, church officials, taxpayers and local citizens have always passed judgment on the president's personality, attitudes, decisions and performance, and they always will.

What, therefore, is so new about the evaluation of presidential performance? The answer is the trend in the last decade to formalize or institutionalize the evaluative process, to substitute for the casual, intermittent, piecemeal and frequently limited judgments a periodic, official assessment based on a systematic search for evidence. This is a relatively new phenomenon in higher education. Kingman Brewster, former president of Yale University, gave the idea considerable publicity in an address to the Yale Political Union in 1969, subsequently published in *School and Society* in April 1970 as "The Politics of Academia."[1]

The forces encouraging more formal appraisals are presented below. The advantages and disadvantages of this type of procedure are discussed in the next two

chapters. A strong case can be made for the full-dress, out-in-the-open assessment of presidential performance. Indeed, in some situations it is unavoidable. While the best ways of managing such a process are the subject of much that follows, the questions must be faced whether such a public examination is in the best interests of the institution or the president. Accountability is essential, but some kinds of accounting do more harm than good. This may well be the case with formal assessments, and we may see a decline in their popularity as rapid as their recent appearance on the academic horizon.

Some Empirical Data

Formal evaluations are still the exception rather than the rule. No one has yet taken an accurate census of the 3300 postsecondary institutions in this country on this subject. Surwill and Heywood made a survey in 1976 of the 321 members of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU), finding that only 14% undertake the formal evaluation of their presidents and another 11% do so on an informal basis.[2] In connection with the present study we sent informal questionnaires to some 900 member boards of AGB representing 1300 institutions. One-third replied, presumably those which had given most thought to the problems and procedures of evaluation. With the addition of a few known instances outside the AGB membership we get the following tabulation:

Evaluations by Types of Institution

	Formal	Informal	None
23 private universities	13%	61%	26%
173 private colleges	33%	54%	13%
6 private junior colleges	33%	66%	
202 total private	31%	55%	14%
49 public four-year	43%	33%	24%
23 multi-campus	64%	27%	9%
6 coordinating boards	17%	83%	
33 community colleges	58%	33%	9%
5 public two-year multi-campus	40%	60%	
116 total public	49%	36%	15%
274 total four-year institutions	35%	49%	16%
44 total two-year institutions	52%	41%	7%
318 overall total institutions	38%	48%	14%

It would be wrong to extend these percentages to the entire universe of postsecondary institutions. Nevertheless the figures are large enough to indicate a genuine concern for evaluation, and the evidence suggests that the practice is growing. It is worth noting, for example, that 20% of the boards reporting informal or presidential assessments indicated their intention to develop formal procedures in the near future.

Reasons for Increased Concern

What are the roots or sources of this new phenomenon? There is no single or simple answer. The need for more careful and thorough assessment of administrative performance stems in part from the extraordinary changes in recent years in postsecondary education and in part from shifts in the political and cultural climate of our society. Since World War II colleges and universities have had to cope, first, with a tidal wave of students whose numbers, expectations and demands have been overwhelming; second, with the revolutions in campus mores and governance for which the decade of the sixties will always be remembered; and, third, with the prospect of the only major reduction, save for the brief period of the great depression, in student body and financial support in the past century. The traditional and comfortable patterns of academic life have been challenged. Some features have become obsolete, and others are under critical scrutiny. Change is always disturbing, and since the president is symbolically, if not actually, responsible for all that happens to and within the institution, his or her performance in office becomes the target of critical scrutiny.

The convulsions of the sixties were in part responsible for the increased trustee concern for institutional purpose, educational programs and academic governance — a concern vigorously encouraged by the publications and conferences of the Association of Governing Boards. There was a time when trustees were largely content to leave the institution's management to the president who, as educator, was presumed to know more about education than the layman. Before the flood of first generation students began demanding postsecondary education as their right, attendance at colleges and universities was viewed as a privilege for a few, and the general public was little concerned about how institutions were managed. Expanding resources, even though limited, permitted rising standards of academic living — intellectual, professional, financial — whereas dwindling resources precipitated competition for survival. No wonder that the performance of the president and his or her administrative colleagues has come in for critical examination, especially by faculty. That performance, once accepted largely on faith and judged on the basis of daily actions, must now prove itself. At least that is the current temper.

From the harried president's side these changes have reduced the time available for quiet reflection and self-assessment. The more active involvement of trustees, who do not always appreciate the complexity of the president's job, adds to the pres-

sure. In self-defense some presidents have turned to periodic evaluations both as a protection against hasty and sometimes ill-informed judgments of their performance and as a device for educating trustees and other groups on the values and intricacies of the changing educational enterprise.

It is not clear whether the recent trend toward term appointments for presidents has been the cause or the consequence of more formal assessments. The president, to be sure, serves at the pleasure of the board. Where reappointment must be faced every three, four or five years, however, the occasion calls for a more thorough examination before the board expresses its pleasure.

Furthermore, the climate of our time puts great emphasis on accountability — undue emphasis some would say. Authority is being challenged. One can see this at work in every walk of life — the family, the school, church, business and state. The demand for accountability works in both directions, not only to those who appoint or employ, but also to those who are served. Thus, students challenge the educational programs of the institutions which they choose for their education and insist upon a voice in the evaluation of the faculty. In the chain of command presidents are responsible to trustees, yet faculty and students demand that they be also accountable to them. There is much to be said for this position, though the pendulum can swing too far. Those in power are in a very important sense the servants of those whom they serve. They must justify their stewardship. The issue is not one of whether or not, but how.[3]

Managing "Organized Anarchies": The President's Job

Any attempt to assess presidential performance presupposes that the assessors understand the nature of the president's job and what constitutes successful performance. One of the serious problems of presidential evaluation is the extent to which presidents are judged on inadequate or mistaken standards. This is a sore point with presidents.

The difficulty does not stem from any failure of college and university presidents to discuss their roles. Indeed, they have produced a considerable body of writing on the subject, some amusing and some ultra-serious.[4] The difficulty lies in the peculiarities of collegiate organization and the consequent ambiguities of the president's role.

A college or university looks like a typical organizational hierarchy with a governing board to set policy and select the president or chief executive officer from whose office and authority stream downwards various chains of command. Occasionally, but increasingly rarely, a college or university president so dominates the institution that the hierarchical pattern does not operate. These, however, are the exceptions. In their provocative and irritating study for the Carnegie Commission — irritating because the number of half-truths tarnishes the value and acceptability of the brilliant insights — Cohen and March characterize the typical educational organization as an "organized anarchy" on the grounds (1) that it has ill-defined and often inconsistent

goals, (2) that it operates on a trial-and-error basis without clear and consistent ideas on how to be effective, and (3) that authority for decisions is widely dispersed and shifts with the changing nature and interests of the participants.[5]

The president is, or should be, the most influential member of the educational community, but the influence is far less than it is popularly perceived to be. It is difficult for the businessman trustee, state legislator, the general public whether speaking as taxpayer or parent or local citizen, to understand the extent to which the governance of higher education is a shared enterprise. The faculty have primary control over the curriculum and the requirements for graduation. Departmental jealousies and power can balkanize a university. Tenure, which safeguards diversity of opinion, also protects the deliberate obstructionists. The growth of faculty unions, especially in public institutions, has introduced additional confusion in the exercise of power. Federal and state regulations and requirements further limit freedom of action.

The president must deal with a variety of constituencies. Is he or she responsible to all of them or only to some? What is he or she to do when the claims of one group conflict with the claims of another? Clearly the president is responsible to the trustees whose agent he or she is. As leader of the academic enterprise the president is *primus inter pares* with the faculty. Needing faculty support and cooperation, he or she must satisfy faculty hopes and expectations. The students want a president, however remote, whom they can respect and be proud of. The president can hardly ignore the student body, not only because they are the primary purpose of the institution, but also because their good will is important to the health of the campus and the future support of the institution. For obvious reasons the alumni compose an important constituency, and the presidents of public institutions must be responsive to state legislators, county or city officials, the state board of education or the state commissioner, and the officers of statewide systems.

The appropriate function of the president will vary with the type of institution. Community college presidents must have a concern for local needs not normally shared by the presidents of four-year institutions. State college and university presidents must attend to state appropriations; private college and university presidents, to the sources of private support. In multi-campus or statewide systems the president or chancellor of a member institution must establish a working relation with the central administration. And for institutions of the same type the president's role will change from one situation to another and from one time period to the next.

Is the president expected to be an educational leader or a sound business manager? Does the institution want an innovator or mediator? Should the president be a gadfly or healer of past wounds? Should he or she concentrate on good administration or on public relations and fund raising? Who is to judge and by what process?

The nature of the job makes assessment

of presidential performance difficult. Students can hardly be expected to know what it is all about. "All too often," writes the student committee on presidential evaluation at a large Midwestern university, "students responded that they had no conception of the president's responsibilities and in many cases no knowledge of who was the president." It is the rare faculty member who can empathize with the president and his or her multifarious and conflicting obligations. There is, indeed, a tendency on the part of faculty to look down on administrators as a lesser breed performing generally useful but not always necessary tasks. As for trustees, how many really understand what the president is doing and the difficulties faced in doing it? Joseph Kauffman quotes one president who typifies the attitude of many others: "Unless something happens to educate the board, they simply won't have any basis for evaluating the president. The board now has no way of knowing what presidents ought to be doing or how well they are doing it."[6]

Boards of trustees are far more sophisticated now then they were only a few years back. More of them do know what the president's job is like. Too many, however, still do not, and the first requirement for a good assessment of presidential performance is to understand the job before attempting to determine how the president is carrying out his or her responsibilities.

"Physician, Heal Thyself"

A second and equally important principle is to understand the board's role. In the governance of any educational institution the functions of board and president are intimately and inseparably related. The board's behavior profoundly affects the president's performance.

Any *valid* evaluation of the president, therefore, presupposes a critical review of the board's status and contribution to the governance of the institution. The consulting team for a small New England college ends its section of recommendations to the board of trustees with the comment: "We feel that we cannot emphasize too strongly the need for the board of trustees to strengthen its own effectiveness in order to insure strengthening the managerial and administrative leadership of the college itself." At a public institution the board committee expresses the same idea in different words. "The purpose of the evaluation is to enable the board to assess the performance of [the president] so as to close the gap between presidential authority and accountability, to ensure that the board and the president concur on mutually agreed-upon goals toward which the college is moving, to identify strengths and weaknesses of the president and the college, and to define by the president and perceive by the trustees the scope and role of the office and [the president's] performance in it. This evaluation will hopefully enhance both trustees' and presidential comprehension and service."

In short, the ultimate purpose of any presidential assessment is not to produce a box score of runs, hits and errors, but to enhance the quality and contribution of the college and university.

1. Brewster wrote: "I think Yale would be better off if it were understood that the trustees would make a systematic reappraisal and explicit consideration of the president's reappointment at some specified interval. This might be seven years after the initial appointment. I would urge the trustees to consider adoption of such a policy. This would mean a termination of my present appointment in June 1970, and an explicit judgment about the wisdom of my reappointment by that time. Under present circumstances the effect would be to make the office more attractive, not only for initial appointment, but also for continuation in it." *School and Society*, volume 98 (April 1970), p. 214. The fact that the Yale Corporation acted on Brewster's proposal lent a certain respectability to the new procedure.

2. "It is interesting to note," they write "that only 71 AASCU institutions reported that they do have a formalized systematic evaluation program for their administrators. If this number is projected as a realistic percentage of the total membership of AASCU, only 32% of all AASCU institutions in America carry out formalized systematic evaluation of their top brass. What are the other 68% doing? Our study indicated that they are doing very little." Benedict J. Surwill and Stanley J. Heywood, *Evaluation of College and University Top Brass: The State of the Art* (Washington, D.C.: American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 1976). The figure of 32% includes institutions that evaluate any of their top administrators and clearly not always their presidents.

3. Consider the line of the view presented by President Brewster in the article already cited. He was addressing the demand, which erupted so dramatically in the sixties, that students share directly in the governance of colleges and universities. Arguing for the necessity of considerable executive freedom in managing the university, Brewster wrote: "The answer to the legitimate student [demand] to have protection against incompetent and unresponsive administration is not formal representation in all matters. It is administrative accountability." Such an accountability in his view consists in full disclosure, the right of petition or redress and public assessment. "The third essential element if accountability is to be real is some regular, understood process whereby reappraisal of the competence of administration and the community's confidence in it can be undertaken without waiting for a *putsch* or rebellion." *Op. cit.*, pp. 212-3.

4. See, for example: Clark Kerr, *The Uses of the University* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1963), Chapter 1; Clark Kerr, Presidential Discontent," in *Perspectives on Campus Tensions*, ed. by David C. Nichols (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1970); John D. Millett, "The Multiple Roles of College and University Presidents" (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1976); James A. Perkins, ed. *The University as an Organization*, prepared for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., 1973); Editorial Projects for Education, "The Impossible Job? (Washington, D.C. 1976); Warren Bennis, *The Leaning Ivory Tower* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1973); *The Contemporary College President: Pressures and Challenges*, selected papers presented by six presidents at a summer conference of AASCU and published by the Association in 1977. My own favorite is the description of his position provided by Henry Wriston when serving as the distinguished president of Brown University: "The president is expected to be an educator, to have been at some time a scholar, to have judgment about finance, to know something of construction, maintenance and labor policy, to speak virtually continuously in words that charm and never offend, to take bold positions with which no one will disagree, to consult everyone and follow all proffered advice, and do everything through committees, but with great speed and without error." *The Structure of Brown University*, a pamphlet published by the University in 1946.

5. Michael D. Cohen and James G. March, *Leadership and Ambiguity: The American College President* (New York: McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., 1974). In spite of its negative and cynical interpretation of the college presidency, perhaps because of it, this is a book that trustees as well as presidents should read. It may prove to be a seven-day wonder, but it does capture and emphasize the problems in the president's role in the present chaotic state of academic governance.

6. Joseph F. Kauffman, "Presidential Assessment and Development," in *New Directions in Higher Education: Developing and Evaluating Administrative Leadership*, ed. by Charles F. Fisher, No. 22 (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1978).

Additional Readings

Brewster, Kingman, Jr. "The Politics of Academia." *School and Society*, Vol. 98 (April 1970).

Cohen, Michael D. and **March, James G.** *Leadership and Ambiguity: The American College President.* San Francisco: McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., 1974.

Dressel, Paul L. *Handbook of Academic Evaluation.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1976. Chapter 16.

Fisher, Charles F., ed. *New Directions in Higher Education: Developing and Evaluating Administrative Leadership.* No. 22. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1978. See especially the editor's notes and the articles by Barry Munitz and Joseph Kauffman.

Ingram, Richard T., ed. *Handbook of College and University Trusteeship.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1980. See especially the chapter "Institutional Leadership and Presidential Assessment."

MacVittie, Robert W. "Trustees and the Evaluation of the Chief Executive Officer." Paper presented at the New York State Regents Eleventh Annual Trustee Conference, 1975. Available through ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 108 538.

Miller, Richard I. *The Assessment of College Performance.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1979. Chapter 7.

Munitz, Barry. "Presidential Evaluation: An Assessment of Institutional Leadership." A report of a study under the aegis of the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, 1976. Copies are available from the Trustee Information Center of the Association of Governing Boards.

Williams, R.E. "Presidential Evaluation." 1977. Available through ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 144 643.

See also the references in footnote 2 of this chapter. The Cohen and March volume contains an extensive bibliography on the subject of the president's job.

Chapter 2

Evaluation — For What Purpose?

Some assessment or evaluation[1] of presidential performance and qualities of leadership inevitably takes place. In spite of the evidence in the table of responses in Chapter 1, few boards of trustees will fail to give some thought to how their president is doing. Even in those instances, faculty, students and others will pass judgment on the president's actions and attitudes, and will not hesitate to make those judgments known. The procedures followed range from the casual and even superficial at one end of the spectrum to the elaborate and systematic at the other.

Two issues face the trustee. The first is not whether to assess, but how to conduct the assessment. The second is what the assessment is intended to accomplish. The decision on the second issue will largely determine the method to be used. Let us, therefore, take the second question first.

Purposes of Evaluation

The two examples appended to this chapter indicate that the purposes of conducting a presidential evaluation can be conceived in different ways. The variations boil down to four major and four minor objectives. The major purposes are:

1. ***To fulfill the board's responsibility*** for the well-being of the institution. Trustees must ever keep in mind that they are the ultimate authority for the college or university. They hire the president, and, if he or she fails, they must replace the president

with someone better qualified. Their responsibility is not only to set goals for both president and institution, but to make sure that the president is leading the institution in the right direction. That is the substance in the matter. Sometimes, however, boards become more concerned with appearance than with substance. The demand for accountability is particularly loud in the public sector, and boards of regents may feel under pressure to demonstrate their authority. "The announcement of the imposition of an evaluation system," writes Kauffman, "is often a symbolic act, calculated to give the appearance of tough management or the assertion of greater control by the governing board."[2]

There is just enough truth in this comment to make it hurt, but it must not be allowed to obscure the legitimate responsibility of governing boards to monitor the president's performance in office.

3. To strengthen the president's position and improve performance. Here and in the next two paragraphs we come to grips with the central and constructive contribution that an administrative evaluation can make. It ought to be of genuine help to the president. It ought to encourage him or her in what is being done well, to strengthen what needs more attention, to redirect where institutional needs or conditions call for new directions. "The results of the review," wrote the chairman of a small southern college, "was the redirection of presidential responsibilities in several areas of the office."

The guidelines drafted by the chancellor's office for the City University of New York state this purpose well. "The evaluation process seeks to assist the president in identifying his/her leadership strengths and weaknesses; to bring the president's leadership style into focus; to provide a mechanism for presidential accountability that transcends from day-to-day preoccupations; and to provide a dignified mechanism for presidential evaluation that avoids the capriciousness and enmity that ad hoc assessment can generate. Ideally, the evaluation process should provide an assessment of presidential leadership that will enhance the leadership effectiveness of the president."

No president can please everyone. If he or she concentrates on internal problems, alumni and trustees may criticize the failure to deal adequately with public relations and fund raising. If the president devotes himself or herself to the latter, faculty and students will complain about lack of attention to their interests and educational concerns. With limited resources, support by the president for one area of the university will be viewed as a threat to other areas, and the president will be criticized for lack of balance or distorted values. "The cold fact of the matter is that as a president you can be bagged at any time," writes Donald Walker, former president of Southeastern Massachusetts University.[3] Individual decisions or episodes can cook up a storm with demands for the president's scalp. Inquiries into administrative performance and record at such times are likely to be highly charged, based on political rather than educational considerations, and unsettling to the insti-

tution. A built-in-system of evaluation would provide a calmer and fairer assessment of presidential performance and, according to Munitz, would result in longer presidential tenure.[4]

3. To review and improve the governance of the institution. Any adequate and fair assessment of presidential performance must include some consideration of other aspects of the institution's governance. Both in his writings and in his consulting work in this field, Barry Munitz insists that the president's actions and decisions must be judged in the context of the performance of the administrative staff, the internal politics of the campus and the role played by the board of trustees. We have seen that the president has less power than he or she is usually assumed to have. It is not all unusual for the president to be blamed for situations over which he or she has no control. "In fact," writes Munitz, "the evaluation of institutional management may be even more vital to the improvement of trustee stewardship than it is for the enhancement of presidential performance."[5]

Many colleges and universities are now combining some form of board self-study with presidential assessment. A small New England college provided the following excellent charge to a review committee consisting of three outside educators: "The Evaluation Committee is charged with making a complete evaluation of [the college] to include its management effectiveness and its interaction with faculty, students, trustees, alumni and the public, as well as its vision and ability in planning constructive policy for the institution."

4. To review and reset institutional goals. Presidential performance, governance and institutional goals are intimately interrelated. The president is expected to provide leadership, and leadership implies goals, both personal and institutional. Many boards have discovered that in reviewing the performance of their president they have perforce been led to a re-examination of the institution's goals. Without knowing where the institution is heading or should be heading, trustees can hardly judge whether the president is the right person to direct the process.

Less important than the four major purposes described above are the following, some of which might be viewed as byproducts of the evaluation process.

5. To educate trustees, faculty and others on the president's role. The changing nature of the president's job was briefly described in Chapter 1. With no single and long established pattern for the position, each constituency within the college or university tends to have its own interpretation of what the president should do. As a result, the president is all too frequently judged by unrealistic standards. Where institutional goals are not clear *and agreed upon,* it is obviously difficult to reach a common judgment on success in achieving them. Over and beyond this, few faculty or students have any notion of the competitive demands on the president's time and energy and the limitations on his or her authority.

Nor do all trustees, whose final decisions are law. The situation is changing. Under the pressure of events and encouragement of organizations such as the Association of Governing Boards, trustees are becoming much more competent as trustees. A consciously undertaken process of evaluation is a wonderful educational device by means of which trustees can complete their understanding of the president's role; and several presidents in our survey reported that the evaluation had created much clearer appreciation by faculty of the variety of issues, competing demands and limitations of power they faced.

6. To decide whether to retain or fire. Although clearly—and ideally—not the major purpose of presidential evaluation, this issue is, nevertheless, in the minds of many trustees at the time the evaluation is made. The guidelines for one midwestern multi-campus system state: "Evaluation in depth should be made in four-year intervals by a board committee with appropriate input from faculty, staff and others. At the time of the initial appointment, it should be made clear that the executive director and the presidents will be retained for an additional term only if the in-depth evaluation results in a specific board decision to renew the appointment." Term appointments naturally invite a review and assessment of presidential performance, as we have seen. Where the emphasis is primarily on terminating or extending the tenure of the incumbent, the process is likely to be more traumatic to the president than it should or need be. We shall return to this problem later.

7. To set an example for faculty and staff evaluations. Students have always been graded, which is one form of evaluation. In recent years evaluations of faculty teaching, research and service to the community have become increasingly common. With dwindling resources and the need to allocate funds in the most productive way, academic programs are being reviewed more critically than ever before. Sooner or later the question is raised, why should not administrative officers including the president be assessed? Many presidents, sensitive to this situation, are calling for their own assessment and that of other administrative officers. Others are deliberately using their own evaluation as example and justification for extending the process to the rest of the academic community.

8. To set salary. Incidental as this may seem, many respondents in our survey gave this as the reason and occasion for their informal review of the president's performance. If it stops with a decision on salary, the opportunity is ill used. It can, however, be the springboard to much more important insights and conclusions.

Choice of Methods

We now turn to the first of the two questions posed at the beginning of this chapter. The method of evaluation appropriate to a given institution will depend upon the pur-

poses envisaged by president and board — and, it is important to add, by the institutional context. There is no need for elaborate procedures if the only purpose is to review the president's salary; indeed, a formal investigation would be counterproductive. Nor will the casual and informal procedures suffice if the intent is to review the governance structure and reset, or reaffirm, institutional goals. The atmosphere of the campus — e.g., the degree of faculty involvement in policy decisions, the degree of trust among faculty, administration and board, the character of the president and personal inclinations of important trustees — all these will influence the choice of methods.

Informal evaluations tend to be more frequent. "More or less continuously," "at each board meeting," "at least once a year" were the comments of many board chairmen responding to our inquiry about their procedures. As a rule they are conducted by the board as a whole or by the executive committee of the board — occasionally by an individual board member or special committee appointed for the specific purpose. The trustees may or may not make inquiries of faculty, administrative officers, students, alumni and others, but such inquiries are likely to be casual and unsystematic. Their information may come largely from rumors floating about the campus. Decisions are apt to be based on general impressions, a sense that things are going well or ill. Since appraisals of this kind tend to occur more frequently and to be limited to trustees or regents, they have a private and confidential character. They are certainly not heralded about nor their results publicized. Most constituencies are unaware of their existence.

Formal evaluations, on the other hand, tend to be less frequent and to be scheduled for regular intervals. They may be done on an annual basis, especially where management-by-objective (MBO) techniques are employed. In general, however, formal assessments are undertaken at three-to-six-year intervals, although the first assessment of a new president may be set for a shorter time. Second, formal evaluations are based on objective as well as subjective evidence.[6] A real effort is made to get factual data on the president's performance — both what he or she does in various situations and how he or she does it. Sometimes questionnaires are distributed widely to faculty, students, alumni and others; sometimes selected samples of various constituencies are consulted. The range of information sought can vary enormously, but some general effort is made to go beyond trustees' feelings about the president and to assess his or her actions in terms of their results and their impact on the various segments of the academic community. Finally, formal evaluations are public events. Hearings, evidence, deliberations and conclusions may or may not be confidential, but the fact that an evaluation is taking place is public knowledge. This has far-reaching implications for the president and for the institution.

Where formal methods have been developed, informal procedures may continue to be used. "the formal system will complement an informal evaluation system," writes Pro-

fessor G. Lester Anderson, director for the Center for Study of Higher Education at Pennsylvania State University. "It will not — it cannot — replace the normal day-to-day judgments, praise, scoldings, and questioning that administrators experience. The formal system should add to the informal system, stabilize the total process, and, as is sometimes necessary, bring about judgments that require official notice and action."[7]

EXAMPLE A—

General Purposes of the Evaluation of the President

(from guidelines used by a Canadian university)

1. To provide the incumbent with constructive and useful information on his past performance.
2. To provide the university with an assessment of the way in which the president is contributing to the fulfillment of the university's mission (i.e., an evaluation from the outside looking in, as it were).
3. To provide the president with an assessment of the way in which he is perceived to be fulfilling the institution's expectations of the president (i.e., an evaluation from the inside looking out).
4. To provide a protective mechanism for the president by ensuring an open and formal means to evaluate the president, thereby forestalling potentially embarrassing confrontations and "back-room politicking."
5. To provide a mechanism whereby the university council can attempt to implement a type of accountability.
6. To ensure that the spirit (if not the exact procedure) which informs the assessment of all professional staff extends to the assessment of the chief executive officer.

EXAMPLE B—

Presidential Evaluation: Objectives

(Proposed in Munitz' report on behalf of the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education and used by a southern state university)

The objectives of a presidential review should be to:

A. Identify specific areas (crucial and approachable issues) of institutional management that need improvement, stressing the value of enhanced trustee and presidential leadership and determining whether administrative talents match academic priorities.

B. Develop more enlightened selection and evaluation procedures and foster the kind of interaction between them that would direct university resources toward educational change and service.

C. Respond to recent climate of expectation concerning evaluation and accountability at the highest levels of academic administration; the issue is not whether assessment is undertaken, but rather the degree of board control, constituency involvement, and public formality.

D. Encourage a mutually supportive relationship between the governing boards and the president and close the gap between their responsibilities and the assumptions of constituency groups.

E. Clarify the balance between internal and external views of the decision-making process, and soften adversary feelings; i.e., the president attains a better sense of how he is seen and judged by those around him.

F. Support other aspects of university performance review by focusing attention upon management and by using evaluation as a vehicle to educate board members as they analyze institutional assumptions and priorities.

---

1. Although some writers draw fine distinctions between the two terms, they are used interchangeably in this study.

2. Charles F. Fisher, ed., *Developing and Evaluating Administrative Leadership* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1978), p. 63. A perfect example is cited by Allan Tucker, former vice chancellor for academic affairs, and Robert B. Mautz, former chancellor of the State University System of Florida, in an article entitled "Presidential Evaluation: An Academic Circus" in the summer 1979 issue of *Educational Record*. "The authors helped inaugurate a program of review of presidential performance as an alternative to a legislatively mandated evaluation. We believed then and emphasized now that such reviews are inappropriate; as they are now, structured reviews do not benefit the institution and they may obstruct exercise of positive leadership."

3. "Myths of the College Presidency" in *The College President: Expectations, Realities, and Myths* (Washington, D.C.: American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 1978).

4. See his excellent chapter, "Reviewing Presidential Leadership" in *Handbook of College and University Trusteeship*, Richard T. Ingram, ed. (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1980). In 1978 the National Association of Independent Schools published an excellent report by a special committee of trustees and heads of schools entitled *Evaluating Our Performance*. "Evaluation as a regular, formal process," states the report, "can minimize the likelihood that either board or head will be suddenly surprised or antagonized by the action or reaction of the other on some major issue. . . . Evaluation should be regarded as part of the search for stability — and a means of getting away from the kind of environment that can put the future of the head (and thus the school) in total jeopardy on any specific issue or issues — which can (and usually do) surface very quickly. . . . Good evaluation does not dwell on the effects of one incident; rather it is concerned with achievement over a period of time." pp. 3-4.

5. See his report for the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, 1976, referred to in the "Additional Readings" at the end of chapter 1. The quotation comes from page 10.

6. "Objective evidence" is an ambiguous phrase. For the most part it consists of the subjective attitudes and opinions of faculty, students and others. Its value lies in the trustees' efforts to check their own impressions and judgments against the views and reactions of others involved in or concerned with the institution.

7. "The Evaluation of Academic Administrators: Principles, Processes, and Outcomes," (University Park, Pa.: Pennsylvania State University, 1975) pp. 11-12.

Additional Readings

Anderson, G. Lester. "The Evaluation of Academic Administrators: Principles, Processes, and Outcomes." University Park, Pa.: Pennsylvania State University, 1976.

Dressel, Paul L. *Handbook of Academic Evaluation.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1976.

Fisher, Charles F., ed. *New Directions in Higher Education: Developing and Evaluating Administrative Leadership.* No. 22. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1978. Especially the chapters by Kauffman and Munitz.

Ingram, Richard T., ed. *Handbook of College and University Trusteeship.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1980.

Munitz, Barry. *Leadership in Colleges and Universities: Assessment and Search.* Oak Brook, Ill.: Johnson Associates, Inc., 1977.

National Associates of Independent Schools. *Evaluating Our Performance.* Boston, 1978.

Tucker, Allan and **Mautz, Robert B.** "Presidential Evaluation: An Academic Circus," *Educational Record,* volume 60, number 3 (Summer 1979), pp. 253-60.

Walker, Donald E. "Goodbye, Mr. President, and Good Luck!" *Educational Record,* volume 58, number 1, (Winter 1977), pp. 53-8.

Chapter 3

Formal vs. Informal Evaluations

Both formal and informal procedures for presidential evaluation have their convinced advocates. By choosing the best examples—i.e., the most favorable institutional climate, the most carefully designed procedures, and participants who are both thoughtful and sensitive—each side can make a highly persuasive case for its method. Let us take a hard look at the alleged advantages and disadvantages of both routes to presidential assessment.

Advantages of Formal Evaluation

1. One great advantage of a public and systematic exercise lies in the fact that it focuses attention on the governance structure of the institution. The president acts within an institutional context which is determined by the attitude of the faculty, the behavior of the student body, the presence or absence of collective bargaining, the influence of alumni, legislators and self-interest groups, the degree of control by the central office in a statewide system, and most critically the extent of authority and responsibility of the governing board. An adequate appraisal of the president's role *must* take into account the attitudes, prerogatives and behavior of these groups. This kind of comprehensive survey is not likely to be undertaken save at intervals of perhaps five years; and since it impinges on the role of other constituencies within the academic community, it calls for an official and public evaluation.

2. A second major imperative for all institutions is a periodic review and resetting of institutional goals or objectives. The end desired can in theory be achieved independently of formal procedures of evaluation; but in practice it usually takes some special event or cause to trigger the reassessment. The selection of a new president should be such an occasion; the review of that president's performance three or five years later should be another. This is likely to be more effective if it is part of a formal assessment. Otherwise it is too easy to duck the long-range and difficult questions of institutional direction. The president of a state institution was well aware of this when he asserted: "First, I requested from the board of trustees a formal evaluation after three years as president.... I felt strongly that they needed to go through an evaluation process in order to make an assessment of where that institution was and where it was heading."

3. If evaluations are to be undertaken, they should be treated as serious and done well. Formal evaluations provide a rational, orderly and systematic way of doing them. They presuppose clearly articulated criteria on the basis of which judgments will be made. They depend in part on systematic efforts to gather opinions both within and without the academic community rather than to rely on casual inquiries and campus rumors. They protect the incumbents from the constant sniping that demeans many campuses and the political pressures that unhappily surface in some state systems. "It is not fair," write three academic administrators, "for the president's performance to be evaluated on the basis of isolated, single incidents which may or may not reflect his total approach to leadership in the institution. It is desirable to develop a comprehensive method of presidential evaluation which takes into consideration the complexities of the job and the various constituencies that the president serves."[1]

4. Formal evaluations, properly done, strengthen the president's position and by so doing lengthen his or her period of effective leadership. Barry Munitz summarizes the advantages in his article, "Strengthening Institutional Leadership," in *Developing and Evaluating Administrative Leadership*, referred to in the preceding chapter. First, they reveal the complexity of the president's job. Second, they reduce the hazard of hasty and unfavorable judgments based on single episodes by emphasizing long-term goals and judging performance over a significant period. Third, they add to the credibility of the administrative process by revealing how the president and the governing structure deal with administrative problems and cope with changes.[2]

The president of a seminary reflects these advantages in a letter to the chairman: "I write to tell you how much I appreciate the way in which you handled the review of the work of the president. I not only found it to be clear, fair and constructive, but the legacy among the students and the staff has been very positive. Throughout the planning, executing and reporting on the process of evaluation, the seminary staff, students and denominational leaders have been much impressed with the thoroughness

and fairness of the process. In some post-board meetings, — — — — has given a report (for example to our Regional Ministers) and in every instance, it has reinforced their confidence in the seminary and its leadership — especially the role of the chairman of the board."

5. They also strengthen the board's position. New trustees are not always familiar with the terms, conditions and expectations under which the new president was appointed. Sometimes those who were on the board at the time have forgotten the circumstances, which may have changed in the meantime. "Experience demonstrates," writes Munitz, "that the evaluation of institutional management can be as vital to the improvement of trustee stewardship as it is to the enhancement of presidential performance. Faced with the limitations of lay participation in governance, trustees find that a review often provides opportunities to explore leadership obligations and to learn the constraints upon and the incentives available to institutional managers. The crucial challenge to board members in the 1980s will be to support their chief executive officers by strengthening their own as well as the president's role. They must learn to transform potential conflicts which would result from ignoring or misunderstanding current conditions into a firmer relationship achieved through mutual insight and symbiotic caring."[3]

6. Because they are public — on the record, so to speak — formal evaluations make clear that the president is accountable for his or her actions. This is particularly important in public colleges and universities where taxpayers are sometimes suspicious and politicians have occasionally tried to interfere.

In short, seven of the eight purposes of presidential assessment discussed in Chapter 2 are readily achieved by means of formal procedures, and the eighth is an easy by-product of the process. Most, if not all, of these advantages of formal evaluation can be achieved through informal procedures if the board is willing to spend the necessary time and is experienced enough to spend it well. But these are big "ifs." Formal procedures do not guarantee that the verdict will be sound, but at least the process, the participants, and the "evidence" are all out in the open. The decision to conduct a formal evaluation is a commitment which carries its own inner sanctions respecting board behavior and responsibility.

Disadvantages of Formal Evaluation

1. First, it is alleged that a formal public evaluation of the president's performance undermines the authority and status of the office. There was a time when college and university presidents were remote and respected figures exercising almost autocratic power. The pendulum has swung to the opposite extreme where presidents are viewed as mediators and errand boys. Surely there is a middle ground, argue many thoughtful commentators, where presidents, like all mankind, are known to be fallible, yet recognized to possess qualities of leadership which justify special status. According to this argument, presidents cannot be

judged, and should not be judged, by the same standards and procedures as others.

A midwestern college president writes that the very term "evaluation" holds for him "a pejorative connotation." "First off," he argues, "it must be admitted that the office of the president carries certain, and I believe essential, powers, which regardless of what some of my more democratic — or populist — colleagues might say, are important to maintain. I think of the power of appointment of faculty, recommendation vis-a-vis tenure, or expulsion of students. When an incumbent is evaluated, in a very real way the authority of the office is subject to evaluation, too. For that reason, if for no other, I would limit the evaluation to the board or to an outside consultant. I do not believe that faculty, students, or staff should use evaluation as a way to attempt to restructure or dilute the authority of the president." Or of the board, one might also add.

If it is thought that this is the self-serving statement of a college president, listen to the strongly worded criticism of a very successful businessman and the board chairman of one of the country's outstanding institutions of higher education: "In my opinion, the trend toward term appointments and formal, periodic reviews for college and university presidents is a mindless urge which mistakenly assumes that the relationship between the board of directors and the chief executive officer is one of supervision rather than joint responsibility and collaboration. It represents an almost complete insensibility to the realities and values of that relationship. ... It also presumes that his success or failure can be best measured in increments of time rather than in response to complex, interlocked and overlapping events whose harmonic effects on each other and the organization itself cannot possibly be measured by 'formal, periodic reviews.' I cannot imagine anything less appropriate or more erosive of the CEO's relationship to his organization or his self-confidence."

2. Second, it is argued that public and periodic evaluations tend further to politicize the president's role. Cohen and March in the study referred to in Chapter 1 make clear how political the president's job has become. Why make it more so? Presidents are supposed to have educational vision, to lead institutions into new paths, to be agents of change. But change upsets accepted patterns; it destroys an already existing equilibrium. Since colleges and universities are reluctant to change, some group on or off campus will bitterly oppose innovation. Does the president stand up and be counted? Does he or she propose changes believed to be in the best interests of the institution, knowing that they will be highly unpopular in some quarters? Or does he or she play it safe? Are decisions made on the basis of political expediency, with an eye to maximum support when the next evaluation (read re-election) is due? "To put the president in this position," writes one university president, "is to throw into the president's decision-making pot a factor which must tempt him at times to abandon the chief criterion for all decisions: namely, is it in the institution's overall best interest?"

3. Some critics maintain that periodic evaluations tend to shorten the president's term of office. Presidents have been known to resign rather than subject themselves to public evaluation, and others have resigned shortly after having been reappointed.[4] Formal evaluations at three-to-five year intervals suggest the notion of term appointments, and in many instances the two are specifically tied together. Consequently, formal evaluations tend seem to favor the practice of a limited assignment, and indeed in some state systems not only the length of term but the number of terms is mandated. If one reviews the history of higher education in America one is struck by the fact that the great creative periods in institutional development were guided by presidents with long tenure. Leadership needs to be exercised over time, and it grows with success. "I am convinced," writes the same university president quoted above, "... that continuity in the presidency is absolutely vital to the cultivation of the big gifts, the strengthening of the ties with foundations and major corporations, and the growing visibility of the institution which cannot be separated from that of the individual who serves as its president."

4. A fourth agreement is that formal periodic evaluations are an evasion of the board's real responsibility, which is to monitor continuously the health of the institution and the contribution of the president. "The periodic assessment of the president," to quote again from a university president, "is a device by which governing boards simply evade this most important of all their responsibilities. Periodic assessment as it is now developing invites 'all hands and the cook' to participate in the popularity poll (review), without regard to the responsibility each may have for the welfare of the institution. It offers a stage for confrontation between all constituencies of the institution... In this context the periodic review of the president tends to create crises which would not otherwise arise, establish periods (sometimes lengthy) of uncertainty and apprehension, and otherwise disrupt the normal activities of the campus."

A variation of this argument reminds one of the old definition of a committee as consisting of the incompetent appointed by the unwilling to do the unnecessary. Many trustees, so the argument goes, are inexperienced. They do not really understand how colleges and universities are run. They assume that there must be a sound "scientific" method of evaluating presidential performance which will provide them with correct answers. Unwilling to give the time and thought necessary to understand the subtleties and individual characteristics of different institutions, they impose an arbitrary conformity which violates the basic nature of academic administration.

Advantages of Informal Evaluation

1. Informal assessments, as we have seen, are conducted by the board of trustees or by some committee of the board. The opinions of faculty, students, administrative officers, alumni, state officials and others may or may not be taken into account.

There is no widespread consultation with constituent groups, no polling of faculty or student or alumni opinions. Consequently these groups do not feel that their views should necessarily prevail. The governing board remains in control of the process and takes full responsibility, as it ought, for the final decisions. It cannot be emphasized too strongly that presidential evaluation is a board function. There is no logical contradiction between this statement and formal procedures. In practice, however, informal processes make it easier for trustees to remain in control and other interested parties to recognize that they are in control.

2. A second advantage of informal assessment is its quiet, low-key quality. It can be carried out without the blare of publicity which is characteristic of more formal procedures. If the evaluation is a public exercise, people begin to talk about the big event. Rumors that the president may be fired excite and disturb the campus. Critics of the faculty, lurking in faculty offices, dormitory lounges and alumni homes, see an opportunity to concert their attack. The president may find it difficult, if not impossible to carry on a constructive program during the course of the investigation. If assessment occurs at unstated intervals, as a natural responsibility of the board and without any special fanfare, it creates a minimum of disturbance.

3. The president is in a special position vis-a-vis the trustees. The relation is quite different from that of deans to faculty or president to deans. While the president is the agent of the board, he or she is also the educator of the board. The board is the final determiner of policy, but in most cases the president proposes and defends the policy. The president is a professional educator (at least in the vast majority of institutions); the trustees are laymen for the most part. While some of them may be very knowledgeable indeed, the majority are amateurs who look to the president for leadership. The longer the president remains in office, the more dominant he or she becomes. As a result, formal evaluations are either insignificant enterprises or traumatic events.

Disadvantages of Informal Evaluation

1. Any review of the informal procedures now being followed in many colleges and universities quickly reveals the disadvantages of this type of assessment. In the first place, many of them are much too casual to be significant or helpful. Some trustee may raise the question which is then quickly disposed of in an executive session of the board; or the chairman appoints an individual or a committee to give the matter thought and bring in a recommendation at the next meeting. The once-over-lightly review hardly deserves the name of evaluation.

2. Whether casual or not, informal assessments tend to be highly subjective. Trustees tend to base their judgments on their personal impressions of the president plus such hearsay comments as happen to reach their ears. The fact that Joe is a nice guy may conceal from the trustees Joe's inadequacies as a president. Joe may look good because he has command of facts and

figures and balances the budget. Trustees are lulled into false security because they do not investigate the price the institution may be paying in deferred maintenance and loss of good faculty through inadequate salaries. Informal assessments do not require the trustees to establish criteria of satisfactory performance. They may of course do so, but in too many cases the president is let off with a superficial and subjective review.

3. Informal assessments are often (though not always) precipitated by special incidents. A sudden and unexpected deficit alarms the trustees. Removal of the football coach outrages the alumni. Failure to raise salaries or the termination of a controversial faculty appointment generates active faculty opposition. The trustees suddenly find themselves faced with controversy, listening to charges and countercharges including demands that the president be fired. So they plunge into a review of the president's performance without preparation and in an atmosphere hardly conducive to reasoned conclusions. Unless informal assessments are conducted under the circumstances described in the following section as ideal, the president is at the mercy of campus factions, alumni pressures and, in the public sector, political maneuvers. Too often trustees are reacting to crises rather than establishing in advance the ground rules for evaluation.

4. Informal assessments normally accomplish only half the purposes set forth in the preceding chapter. They fulfill in some fashion the board's responsibility to monitor the president's performance. They strengthen the president's position and can lead to an improvement in his or her performance. They can lead the trustees to the decision whether to retain or fire the president, and they provide some basis for determining the president's remuneration. They could, but for the most part they do not, assess the governance of the institution, review and reset institutional goals, educate trustees, faculty and others on the nature of the president's job; and because they are private rather than public they do not set an example and pattern of evaluation useful for other administrative officers and for faculty.

The Ideal Design

An honest appraisal of the pluses and minuses of both formal and informal procedures leaves room for considerable differences of judgment. What works in one situation will be disastrous in another. The evidence to date, while not conclusive, suggests that formal evaluations are likely to generate as many negative consequences as good and should be undertaken with utmost caution.

There is, however, a procedure that maximizes the advantages and minimizes the disadvantages of both methods. In a few institutions the board of trustees is so responsive and responsible, so sensitive to and knowledgeable about the concerns of the college or university, so close to the president and his or her hopes and plans and actions, that president and board have developed a high degree of mutual trust and support. This depends on the personalities involved and their capacity to work in close cooperation. It requires complete

candor from the president and a willingness to give a very considerable amount of time on the part of the trustees.

It is more easily achieved by a small board than a large, and—in spite of the generally larger size of the boards of private institutions—it seems to occur more frequently in private colleges and universities than in public. For example, the chairman of an eastern college writes: "Officers and chairmen of key committees meet frequently with the president and among themselves. There is ample opportunity to observe, consider and discuss his performance without attempting a formal review procedure. We question how effective the latter is, especially in a small liberal arts institution." And a chairman of a similar midwestern institution echoes the sentiment: "I believe that any formal procedure to 'review a chief executive officer' of a college is a waste of time. It seems to me that the principal function of the board of trustees is to monitor the performance of the president of the institution on a continuing basis.... A formal review designed to assess the performance of the president would, in my judgment, serve no purpose and, indeed, has risks attached to it."

From the Far West comes this eloquent statement by the chairman of another private college: "We are a small board of nine trustees. At least seven members spend substantial time in significant and substantive exchanges with the president. The trustees are given copious and high quality information about the college, pay close attention to refinement of that information so that it reflects the implications of commitments both in human terms of values and in costs expressed in resources.... In addition to reports and studies mailed prior to meetings or delivered verbally by the president's senior administrators, the trustees collectively discuss with the president in executive session progress planned or achieved toward presidential and institutional goals and objectives. It is our conviction that formalization of this process, particularly written verbalization of a fluid and developing relationship, would either be stultifying if precise or platitudinous if not."

There are two reasons why the ideal situation is more frequently approximated in private than in public institutions. First, the governing boards of private colleges and universities are for the most part self-perpetuating, and the president usually has considerable say in the choice of members. It is, therefore, not surprising that president and trustees frequently enjoy a high degree of mutual understanding and trust. The trustees or regent of state institutions or systems, on the other hand, are normally appointed (sometimes elected) for limited and rotating terms, and their choice is often based on political considerations. Governors have been known to appoint regents for the express purpose of opposing or curbing the president's actions and policies.

Second, the state university or college functions in a public political arena. Its money comes from taxes. Its policies must be responsive to public needs or expectations. Its president is a public servant. Al-

though he or she does not or should not hold office while the present governor or political party is in power, the demand for public accountability endemic in the political scene inevitably includes the most important and usually the most expensive operation under state control.

In the light of these differences it is therefore interesting to listen to the reflections of the president emeritus of a western state university: "If we had discussed the subject of presidential evaluations, I would have had no hesitancy in revealing my bias; i.e., that nothing is superior to a continuous ongoing evaluation by a governing board that meets frequently, considers the president's formal recommendations, and provides the president with an opportunity for frequent informal reports concerning current institutional issues and probable future opportunities. It is acknowledged that the growth of 'systems,' the reduction of areas of discretionary responsibility by reason of both federal aid state legislation, and the concomitant increase in litigation, creates obstacles, perhaps insurmountable, to the application of this method and that more formal procedures and instruments may be required. In the absence of some overriding requirements, however, it is of questionable benefit to substitute periodic complexity for continuous vigilance."

1. James L. Wattenbarger, N. Dean Evans and G.L. Mears, "Who's Evaluating the President?" *Community and Junior College Journal*, February 1979, p.8.

2. *Developing and Evaluating Administrative Leadership*, ed. by Charles F. Fisher (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1978), p. 13. See also relevant sections of Munitz' *Leadership in Colleges and Universities: Assessment and Search* and his chapter "Reviewing Presidential Leadership" in the *Handbook of College and University Trusteeship*, ed. by Richard T. Ingram (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1980).

3. *Handbook of College and University Trusteeship*, p. 384. Note the comment of the Rev. Dexter L. Hanley, S.J., former president of the University of Scranton: "...I view evaluation of the president not only as an exercise in the accountability in his office but as a protection against sudden, arbitrary, and capricious action of the board. The board is challenged not only to measure the performance of the president but its own performance in setting priorities." "Evaluating a President," *AGB Reports*, volume 17, number 5 (March/April 1975), p. 44.

4. See Kauffman's chapter in *Developing and Evaluating Administrative Leadership*, ed. by Charles F. Fisher, especially pp. 64-5, where he quotes a number of university presidents disillusioned by the process of formal evaluation. This is corroborated by the findings of Vance D. Patterson in his study of the evaluations of the presidents of the state institutions of Pennsylvania, submitted as a doctoral thesis at the University of Pittsburgh, 1979. On the other hand, many of the presidents in our survey expressed satisfaction with their assessments and felt that they strengthened their position on campus.

Additional Readings

Fisher, Charles F., ed. *Developing and Evaluating Administrative Leadership.* New Directions for Higher Education, No. 22. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1978.

Hanley, Dexter L. "Evaluating a President." *AGB Reports,* volume 17, number 5, (March/April 1975).

Johnston, Archie B. "Evaluation of Administrators." ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, 1977. ED 136 858.

Kauffman, Joseph F. "The New College President: Expectations and Realities." *Educational Record,* volume 58, number 2 (Spring 1977).

MacVittie, Robert W. "Trustees and the Evaluation of the Chief Executive Officer." New York State Education Department, 1975. Available through ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, ED 108 538.

Munitz, Barry. *Leadership in Colleges and Universities: Assessment and Search.* Oak Brook, Ill.: Johnson Associates, Inc., 1977.

_____. "Presidential Evaluation: An Assessment of Institutional Leadership." Washington, D.C.: Fund for Improvement of Postsecondary Education, 1976.

Wattenberger, James L.; Evans, N. Dean and **Mears, G.L.** "Who's Evaluating the President?" *Community and Junior College Journal,* February 1979.

Williams, R.E.: "Presidential Evaluation." 1977. Available through ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 144 643.

Chapter 4

The Ingredients For A Good Mix

In Appendix A will be found a spectrum of specific samples. The variations in procedure are considerable. They depend upon the nature of the governing board, the type and complexity of the institution, and what can best be described as the tone and temper of the campus.

The Attitude of the Trustees

The nature of the assessment of presidential performance will be determined in part by the attitudes of the president and particularly by the trustees or regents. It is virtually impossible for the president to say that he or she should not be evaluated. In some cases the president has resigned rather than subject himself or herself to a formal procedure of assessment. In others he or she can raise so many difficulties that the board, willingly or reluctantly, settles for a simpler or less thorough or less public formula that it might have preferred. At the opposite extreme are those situations where the chief executive has to coerce a reluctant board into making an evaluation of his or her performance in office. "After being president here for five years," writes a private college head, "I requested the trustees to make a formal evaluation of my performance... The trustees were very reluctant to initiate the process and some older faculty members cautioned me that it was unwise to do so. I insisted, so the chairman of the board appointed a committee of trustees...."

The reluctance of some trustees to engage in serious evaluation may be a reflec-

tion of their preoccupation with other affairs and unwillingness to give the time and energy required for the exercise of their responsibilities. It may be due to ignorance and timidity. Not knowing quite how to proceed, trustees worry over rumors and incidents and fall into impromptu and unplanned judgments highly prejudicial to the president because they proceed on inadequate information and uncertainty as to the proper procedure. It may be due to their belief that the relationship between the president and the board is so intimate and successful that it would be damaged by an "official" evaluation.

Furthermore, that relationship, as we have noted, is an ambivalent one. While the board appoints the president as its agent and should, therefore, want to make certain that he or she is doing what is expected and required, the president is the leader of the institution and the educator of the board. In private institutions the president has, or should have, a major voice in the selection of new trustees. Whether they support the president or not, the president has an obligation to see that they are informed about the institution, the problems it faces, and their responsibilities as trustees. All this should not prevent the trustees from exercising their responsibility to monitor and help improve the president's performance, but it does create a situation in which many are hesitant to follow a course which might seem to question the president's leadership.

There is yet another facet to the president/trustee relationship which influences the character and extent of any evaluation. Having invested large amounts of time, energy and emotion in selecting the president, trustees are reluctant to question their efforts and to face the necessity of scrapping the results. If the incumbent is less good than expected, it seems easier to get along with what is there than to go through the trauma of firing the president and seeking a successor. Thus, the temptation is strong not to inquire too closely into the president's performance. Better let sleeping dogs lie, even when the dog is full of fleas. A formal evaluation might uncover a situation that required action. Conscience dictates assessment, but convenience suggests that one not look too hard. The failure of trustees to face their responsibility leads to an unstable and dangerous situation. The longer it goes on, the worse it becomes until trustees are finally forced to take action which would have been easier when the problem first arose.

Differences of Institutional Type

The table in Chapter 1 shows some revealing differences between public and private institutions. Both exhibit the same percentage, 86%, using some kind of evaluation; but only 31% of the private colleges and universities in our sample make use of formal procedures, whereas 50% of the public institutions do so.

Among private institutions governing boards are free to decide as they wish how best to exercise their responsibility for watching over the performance of the president and the progress of the institution. In the public arena however, trustees or regents

are publicly elected or appointed by the governor or the legislature. Colleges and universities are for the most part tax-supported, and wherever public funds are involved, public demand for accountability is sure to follow. Provision for formal evaluation is, therefore, frequently written into the charter and bylaws or officially mandated by the office of the commissioner of education or the governing board for the system.

State college and university presidents are not public officials in the same sense that the governor, legislators and other elected state officers are, and their institutions have a degree of autonomy that political offices do not. This institutional freedom is one of the great merits of public higher education in America. Nevertheless, the support of postsecondary education represents a major item in every state's budget, sometimes the largest single item, and it is therefore natural that the public should demand to know how their money is being spent and how those chiefly responsible are performing. This supervision of performance is especially pronounced among community colleges with their close ties to the local community and often to the local school system.

Furthermore, the unhappy intrusion of politics into the administration of state colleges and universities, both two-year and four-year, the demand for special favors, the threat of withholding funds unless so-and-so is being fired or such-and-such is done, add an element of precariousness to the president's job. In many situations public endorsement of the president and administration by the governing board after a thorough evaluation may provide the only safeguard. Since others within the institution are being evaluated, the president may add to his or her credibility by taking the lead.

Size and complexity also effect the way evaluations are conducted. With notable and distinguished exceptions private institutions tend to be small, and trustees, if on their toes, can keep track of what is going on much more easily than in large and complex universities. Where student bodies are 20-40,000, faculty in the thousands, schools, centers and institutes by the dozen, trustees cannot be expected to be continuously aware of what is happening. Periodic full-dress assessments of institutional goals and administrative performance are almost the only way by which trustees can feel reasonably certain how things are faring.

The Temper of the Campus

Each college and university has its own ethos, usually the reflection of history. Some institutions seem to have a tradition of strong presidential leadership. Faculty and staff may gripe about the president's high-handed style, but they would not seriously entertain the idea of challenging the president's authority. On other campuses the faculty think of themselves as the central policy forming body and chew their way through a succession of hapless presidents. On some campuses there is a high degree of mutual trust among trustees, administrators, faculty and students; on others distrust, suspicion and hostility are rife.

Where all is going well, or at least reas-

onably well, it is possible to stage formal evaluations without creating more problems than are solved. But trustees must be prepared to give considerable time and thought to the process, more time and thought than the record suggests many trustees are prepared to give. Where the temper of the campus is troubled, where hostility among competing groups is rampant, where suspicion of motives lurks in every breast, the evaluation of the president is a tough assignment. Informal procedures may create less havoc. If formal assessment is the order of the day, it will take great wisdom and personal attention on the part of the trustees. As we shall argue in a later chapter, this is where the services of a skilled consultant can be invaluable.

There is, in short, no one sound pattern of presidential evaluation, no single formula applicable to any situation. There may be a procedure that is more appropriate to college X or university Y than any other. In deciding what path to follow it is essential to grasp the necessary and desirable ingredients of an acceptable evaluation and to decide on the steps to be followed. Some components are essential for any evaluation; some can be omitted or dealt with softly depending on the circumstances.

Chapter 5

Necessary and Desirable Components

Several things are needed for a useful assessment:

1. The first is a conscious intent to evaluate. We have seen that some boards assert that they do not assess the president's role and contribution to the institution, and that others do so in a casual and half-hearted sort of way. A thoughtful and useful evaluation requires deliberate foresight and planning.

2. Once the decision has been made or the mandated time for taking action has arrived, the board must appoint an individual or a committee to take charge. Informal evaluations may be the responsibility of a single trustee, and in multicampus systems the chancellor or commissioner may be authorized by the board or by statute to conduct the evaluation on behalf of the board. A committee is the usual device.

This committee normally consists of three to five trustees. Occasionally a college or university will use the same formula for evaluation as it used for search and selection. One respondent for an institution that used a selection committee composed of trustees and a search committee made up of faculty, students and alumni described their evaluation procedures as follows: "Although couched in terms of the selection process, the board decided to employ the same procedure to review the president prior to deciding whether to reappoint him. The 'appraisal' document was prepared by the analog of the search committee."

The policy adopted by the trustees of the State University of New York, however,

makes more sense. In the revised guidelines adopted in June 1979 they state: "The presidential review process is distinct from the initial search process for a president. In the latter, the various constituents of the campus join to search for, and the College Council recommends to the trustees, the best possible candidate or candidates for the position. The search is extensive, and the screening process may be both lengthy and complex.... The presidential review process differs from the preceding in that the broad search element is not a factor, for the president being evaluated is known to all concerned. He or she has already served under the direction of the board of trustees and the chancellor as the chief administrative officer of the campus. The review is a trustee function and process initiated by the chancellor on behalf of the trustees."

3. Any review of the president's performance should take into account the institutional context, both the unique characteristics of the college or university and the governance structure. To assess the president's actions, or failures to act, by themselves is grossly unfair. The limits of presidential power, as noted in Chapter 1, must be fully understood. Procedures that were designed for one institution may not be suit another. Beware of standard formulas.

4. Evaluation presupposes criteria by which judgments are made. These criteria ought to be explicit, understood and agreed by all concerned, especially the president. Such criteria ought, especially in the first assessment at least, to have been laid down at the time of appointment.

5. The president should always be consulted and should participate in planning the evaluation. There should be no surprises or end runs. His or her cooperation is essential for success.

6. More and more evaluations are recognizing the desirability of beginning with a self-assessment by the president. How the president sees his or her performance is an important—perhaps the most important—component in the whole process.

7. Evaluation is a trustee responsibility. To be sufficiently well informed to make sound judgments, trustees need to have some knowledge of the president's rapport with other members of the academic community and with off-campus constituencies. This kind of evidence is important, but tricky, and the use of experienced consultants can avoid many errors in judgment.

8. Just as the president should be involved in the planning of the review process, so he or she should be informed of the results. Statements identified with individuals should be confidential, but comments not so identified may be helpful to the president who should also see the tabulated results of answers to questionnaires. The president should be given an opportunity to review and respond to the committee's report before it is presented to the board of trustees. It is important that he or she see it because it is an effective way of making clear to the president his or her strengths and weaknesses and thereby improving future performance. It is important that he or she respond to it because the evidence may be distorted and judgments based on it

unfair. The committee may want to modify its assessment in the light of the president's arguments or it may prefer to present those arguments along with its original report. This is a delicate and sometimes difficult situation in which the committee must be sensitive to the president's legitimate concerns and yet insist upon having the final word.

9. After the board has considered the results of the evaluation, its decision should be made public. The more formal and public the process of assessment, the more urgent is the need to annouce the outcome. Even informal assessments will sometimes create ripples on college campuses, and any cover-up of the results will create more rumors, anxiety and unrest. It is a matter of courtesy to those who have shared in the process to let them know the outcome. It can be of crucial importance to the status and authority of the president that the community knows he or she has the support of the board.

In states with sunshine laws trustees have no option, and their problem is to safeguard the confidential information on which their report and recommendations are based. The second case study in section 4 of Appendix A provides a good example of distinguishing between public and private information. In a private college where some question had been raised about the president's performance, the board issued a public statement printed in the college newspaper outlining the procedures used by the evaluation committee, the number and kind of people interviewed, various structural concerns needing attention, and included the statement: "The [board of trustees] reaffirms its confidence in [the president's] leadership. The board recognizes his achievements as president, his awareness and willingness to seek remedies to current campus problems, and his ability, energy and devotion to meet important challenges before the college." Whether it be a simple statement or a full report, which many boards have made available in the interests of full disclosure, some public statement on where the board and the president stand is desirable as a conclusion to the exercise.

10. Time is an important factor in conducting evaluations—both the frequency and the duration.

Timing is irrelevant where assessment is genuinely continuous, but this is the exception rather than the rule. Where the president is given a term appointment, it is natural to make some kind of review or evaluation before reappointment. If, however, the central purpose of the assessment is to strengthen the president's performance, there is much to be said for separating it from the question of retention or dismissal.

A number of institutions are moving in this direction. Annual evaluations tend, as we noted earlier, to be tied in with salary considerations and short-term institutional objectives (MBO). They approximate the kind of constant monitoring that is most desirable. Hence it is interesting to find a number of institutions with formal evaluations every three, four or five years moving also toward annual reviews. The officer in charge of personnel and faculty for a state-

wide system is convinced that periodic evaluations are useless without annual assessments. "As you know from reading our materials," she writes, "we have a rather comprehensive five-year evaluation of the tenure of the president as well as an annual evaluation for our presidents. The latter is an informal process entered into by the president, the chairman of the board of regents and the chancellor of the state university system. The informal evaluation was instituted on a regular basis this fall for the first time in this system. From all reports the informal process is working well, and serves as a complement to the formal process."

A certain flexibility in setting formal evaluations is desirable. Some crises, such as faculty demands for the resignation of the president, may force the board to agree to a formal evaluation.[1] This is particularly likely where no previous schedule for assessments has been established. It provides an important reason for doing so. In general, however, assessments should not be made at times when the campus is upset over some passing situation or decision or temporary outrage or opposition may distort the results.

The length of the process is another factor to consider. Some have stretched over a year's duration. That is too long a time to keep the campus stirred up and the president less than comfortable. After experimenting with longer evaluation the State University System of Florida has limited its procedures to two months. SUNY, which has operated on a nine-month program, decided in June 1979 that no evaluative process should exceed four months. Two, three and four months seem to be the usual times required, though an occasional respondent indicated that one month sufficed and one completed the job in two weeks.

11. Evaluations are a tricky business and should themselves be evaluated. Many boards as a result of their initial experience are establishing continuing committees on evaluation with the responsibility both to assess the success of the evaluation process just completed and to plan for a similar or better process in the future. This can result in more regular and perhaps more informal evaluations. It will certainly produce a group of trustees experienced in the process and available for help to the president at times of special stress or crisis.

Appendix B contains five documents illustrating procedures here discussed. Four are guidelines used by institutions for the steps to be followed. The fifth is an example of the public announcement after the evaluation had been completed.

1. In at least one instance the faculty of a state university undertook its own evaluation of the president when the board refused to do so at the faculty's request.

Chapter 6

The Choice and Use of Criteria

Any assessment of presidential performance presupposes standards by which judgment is made. How are these standards or criteria determined? In general they emerge in four different ways.

1. Many institutions have developed board or faculty handbooks which contain a description of the duties expected of the president as well as of other officers. Evaluation is then based on this public, or at least widely known and accepted, statement. In the nature of the case such a catalogue of presidential responsibilities is likely to be very general, though some recognition is frequently given to special duties of presidents within a statewide system and to the religious obligations of presidents of certain church-related colleges.

2. The ideal time to settle the specific expectations of the president is when he or she is appointed. If the selection process is intelligently conducted, the committee will have reviewed candidates in terms of specific institutional needs and the board will have appointed the individual who can best pursue institutional goals.[1] The president should know upon appointment what goals he or she must seek to achieve. If these had not been made clear before, after coming on board he or she should sit down with the chairman or the appropriate committee and work them out together.

3. A third approach is a variation of the one just mentioned. The president and board may reach agreement on the objectives of

presidential activity not at the beginning of the president's tenure, but at some subsequent time, perhaps when the question of evaluation is first raised and the need for benchmarks is recognized.

4. Finally, the president may be invited to set his or her own criteria for assessment. Quite often the president's self-assessment, which will be examined in the following chapter, provides the standards by which the president will be judged. One can never be sure that some element of bias due to self-interest may not have crept into such a statement. But if the president honestly analyzes the major needs of the institution, reports what progress he or she has made in dealing with them, and outlines the steps to be taken in the future, a useful picture of the health of the institution and the performance of the president is likely to emerge. In those cases where the president is not instructed to develop his or her own criteria it is imperative that the board allow him or her to review the criteria that the board has developed before they are used.

Importance of Prior Agreement

Sometimes evaluations, unfortunately, are undertaken without prior agreement on the criteria by which the president is to be judged, and this has led to unhappiness, indeed bitterness, on the part of some presidents (and occasionally of some trustees). The chairman of a private college board emphasizes the need to prepare job descriptions and performance standards for each administrator, adding the comment: "To evaluate any individual's performance unless these elements are in place is an injustice and counterproductive."[2] In another private college wrestling with serious problems of mission and administration the committee of outside experts called in to make an evaluation reported: "At present, it does not appear to us that the board of trustees has an adequate job description of what it expects in a president. It is of the utmost importance for the board to develop such a description at the earliest possible time both in assessing the performance of the incumbent president and its needs in a chief executive for the future." Across the country at another institution the chairman bluntly stated: "A set of criteria is developed based upon a plan of accomplishment and duty assigned to the president by the board. All criticisms of the president not based upon his assigned duties as beforehand established are not considered valid."

An additional reason for setting the standards in advance and for making them public stems from the conflicting expectations from different constituencies. Faculty, students, administrative staff, alumni, and trustees are quite apt to have different ideas about what the president should be doing. Trustees may want a tough administrator who will balance the budget and keep the students in line. Faculty are likely to favor a president who will protect their status, support their research and be sure their salaries are increased. In multi-campus systems there is frequently tension between the system's chancellor or chief executive officer, who wants cooperation from the presidents of member institutions, and the faculty,

students and local board or council, who judge the president by his ability to protect the autonomy of the institution.[3]

A final reason for getting the criteria out in the open is the need to be quite clear whether one is evaluating the presidency alone or the presidency as one part of the governance system, whether the president as a person or the president's office is being assessed, and whether judgments are to be based on past performance or future expectations. Father Hanley, former president of the University of Scranton, drives the point home. "First and foremost," he writes, "I believe a clear distinction must be made between evaluating what a president has done and evaluating what he should now do. By this, I mean that a president's administration should basically be measured against what he was asked to do by the board of trustees — not against some sudden new need that the board now recognizes.... If this is done," he continues, "then an evaluation may ask these two questions: First, has the president done what he was asked to do? Second, are the needs of the college such that he should now be asked to do something else? These questions should not be confused."[4]

Choice of Criteria

By what standards should presidents be judged? The responses to our survey provide a rich variety of criteria, a few examples of which are appended to this chapter and included in Appendix C. They differ in detail and in relative emphasis, but are remarkably similar in the areas of presidential activity to be assessed. The special problems and needs of the college or university under examination are sometimes clearly stated, sometimes implied by the importance given to certain questions. The following six areas represent a distillation of many checklists.

1. ***Academic management and leadership.*** Whatever else they may be, colleges and universities are educational enterprises, and their presidents, with occasional exceptions, are expected to be competent leaders and managers in educational matters. Presidents are expected to understand the differences among educational programs, to recognize the value of scholarship and research, to respect academic freedom, to be concerned about the curriculum, to recruit and retain able faculty, to work constantly for better quality, to generate and sustain a vision of what the institution should be.

2. ***Administrative management and leadership.*** Colleges and universities are also businesses, and some are very big business. Both size and complexity call for first-rate administrative skills. Effective organization enhances the institution's mission and purpose, and effective organization means adequate staffing, delegation of authority, supervision, long-range planning. Good management involves good personnel policies, the capacity to surmount emergencies, a willingness to consult with others when time permits and to act decisively when action is needed.

3. Budget and finance. Does the president understand and control the finances of the institution? The board wants a balanced budget and clear financial accounting. In the long run the budget determines the nature and quality of the educational program. Both will depend in part on the quality of the faculty, which in turn depends in part on the salary levels. If the president is to be the leader of the college or university, he or she must know what the figures mean and understand the consequences when they are changed.

4. Fund raising. Private colleges and universities depend primarily on private money and secondarily on public grants. For public institutions the situation is reversed. Either way, money must be raised, not just tuition and fees, but private gifts and public appropriations. This is the constant labor of many individuals. It needs to be directed and encouraged by the president who must participate as well as direct. As the symbol and spokesman for the institution, the president will have the strongest appeal.

Some would subsume fund raising under finance. Others would put it under our next category, external relations. It makes no difference so long as the president is in there pitching.

5. External relations. Some presidents show their greatest talents in public relations; others have little aptitude or liking for this field. Yet no president can escape it entirely, and the standing and reputation of the institution will depend in no small part on his or her performance. Alumni need to be kept loyal. Legislators, state officials, county officers must be wooed. Prospective students need to be attracted. It helps when local citizens are proud of rather than hostile to the college or university. The ramifications are almost endless.

6. Personal characteristics. What a president does, it might be argued, is more important than the way he or she does it. The evaluation, therefore, should be of the office or of the performance in office. But the fact remains that the way a person behaves is sometimes as important as what he or she does. Leadership is based in part on very personal qualities—charisma, sensitivity, courage under fire, fairness and decency. A concern for others is important, a willingness to listen to their opinions. But so are convictions about what is important or what is right and the willingness to stand up when the going is rough and take responsibility for one's decisions. Any assessment of presidential performance must take some account of the character, personality and style of the president. The ideal person for one situation may be a disaster in another. No matter how right the president may be, he or she is of doubtful value to the institution if everyone in it is alienated.

This is particularly true of the relation of the president to the board of trustees. The board and the president must be able to work together in a relationship in which each makes a distinctive contribution. A president who is so dominant a personality that the trustees become rubber stamps and a board (or chairman) who treats the president as an errand boy are equally

disastrous to the health and strength of the institution.

These criteria can be treated in broad general terms or they may be broken down into lists of specific requirements. Example A appended to this chapter illustrates the former, Example B the latter.

EXAMPLE A—
A Private College

PRESIDENTIAL CRITERIA

Everyone will have his own view of ____'s president and its administration. Our committee does not wish to restrict the range of your comments by establishing too narrow a definition of guidelines. Please feel free to speak to us on any aspect of [the president's] performance and administration that concerns you. We would, however, be particularly interested in having your views on certain matters.

The Future of the College

- What do you anticipate will be necessary in the coming years to maintain and enhance _____ as an excellent liberal arts college?
- What are the qualities you think will be necessary in the president and administration to achieve these results?
- Are there specific actions that could be taken that would significantly strengthen the institution?

Decision Making

- What are your views on the degree of input and the participation of others in the decision making affecting the college community?
- Are the president and members of his administration sensitive to diverse viewpoints? Are the decisions reached objectively and fairly?

Leadership

- Does the president identify problems before they escalate into crises?
- When problems do arise, are they effectively handled?
- Does the president articulate goals of excellence for the college and inspire commitment to those goals on the part of the college community?

Administration

- Are administrative matters within the college effectively and efficiently handled?
- Is the president effective in leading fund raising and managing the business operations of the college?

In the last several years the president and administration of the college have had several priorities. One was to provide good conditions for working relations among members of the college community in keeping with the traditions of academic institutions. The second was to understand and plan for financial challenges faced by the college. The third was to take steps to maintain and strengthen _____'s overall excellence. Based on the performance of the administration, how do you think it has dealt with these matters? What challenges

do you see ahead, and do you believe the administration has the strength, capability and commitment to meet them? Do you believe that the administration can develop, with appropriate assistance from the rest of the college community, a sound vision for _____'s future? Would you personally want to ask [the president] to continue as president for the next period of years?

EXAMPLE B—
A City University

CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION

The evaluations and self-assessments should address themselves to the following major areas in addition to those enumerated in the board of higher education guidelines.

A. Academic Planning and Administration

1. The existence of well developed and widely understood institutional goals and objectives.
2. Existence of a sound academic program review procedure which serves as the basis for budget and staff allocations, program evaluation, implementation of the policies of the board of higher education, and implementation of the college's institutional goals and objectives.
3. The ability to encourage and initiate curriculum changes in response to the needs and interests of students and the larger society.

B. Problem Solving and Decision Making

1. Evidence of ability to identify and analyze problems and issues confronting the institution.
2. Evidence of ability to identify potential areas of conflict.
3. Ability to make decisions in critical situations and to handle crises.
4. Awareness of implications of decisions and ability to assume responsibility for decisions.
5. Ability to implement decisions and sensitivity to impact of decisions.
6. Evidence of ability to comprehend the interrelated nature of such factors as budgeting, curriculum, social and political realities, group interests and pressures, laws, rules and regulations having influence on the management of the college.
7. Evidence of sound fiscal management and resource allocation conducive to achieving institutional goals and objectives.

C. Faculty and Staff

1. Ability to assist in recruiting and maintaining a distinguished faculty.
2. Ability to provide encouragement and support of scholarly activities of the faculty.
3. Ability to encourage sound decision making in the recruitment, promotion and tenuring of faculty.

4. Ability to encourage broad based faculty participation in all facets of the college.
5. Evidence of ability to select an effective administrative team.
6. Ability to determine issues which are the proper responsibility of the faculty and those of the administration.
7. Evidence of on-going procedures for evaluation of faculty and administrators.
8. Ability to relate to faculty within the particular governance mechanism of the institution.
9. Effectiveness in forming, developing and supervising an administrative network for making and implementing policies.
10. Evidence of ability to delegate responsibility.
11. Development and implementation of an effective affirmative action plan.

D. Students

1. Ability to relate to students individually or in groups.
2. Evidence of formal and informal mechanisms for involving students in decision making.
3. Quality of services provided students.
4. Evidence of recognition of, and sensitivity to, the diversities of the student body.
5. Evidence of mechanism for informing students of policy changes and explaining changes to student body.

E. Relationships to the University System

1. Ability to work with other university presidents, the central administrative staff, the chancellor and the board of higher education.
2. Ability to relate to and communicate with the community in which the college and university are located.
3. Understanding the role of politics and governmental offices as they relate to the college and the university.
4. Relations with professional associations and educational institutions outside the university.
5. Ability to relate to elected representatives and governmental bodies.
6. Effectiveness in representing the institution to its various publics.

1. See the author's *Presidential Search: A Guide to the Process of Selecting and Appointing College and University Presidents*, (Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards, 1979), Chapters 3 and 8.
2. See pp. 76-7 of *Presidential Search*, cited above, for various comments on the absence of agreed-upon criteria.
3. See Joseph F. Kauffman's chapter, "Presidential Assessment and Development" in *Developing and Evaluating Administrative Leadership*, ed. by Charles F. Fisher. Kauffman quotes a university professor who said: "Perhaps the most difficult problem for the president is the realization that if he does his job well under contemporary conditions, he almost certainly will be disliked by faculty. Indeed, a trustee once said to me that if the faculty praised my performance, he would be suspicious that I was not carrying out the wishes of the board or pursuing the well-being of the institution as a whole." And the head of an institution within a university system commented: "I am tough. They'll resent my fighting for my campus all the time. They'll get you if you keep fighting them — especially if you win some." (pp.62-3, 67).
4. "Evaluating a President," *AGB Reports*, volume 17, number 5 (March/April 1975). In a similar vein the assessment committee of a distinguished liberal arts college with a national reputation introduces its report with the statement: "Our committee decided that it was important, not merely to review the past performance of the administration of [the college], but also to investigate the present state of the college and the challenges that the future would likely hold. The bulk of our report concentrates on the present state of the college and the future."

Additional Readings

Hanley, Dexter L., S.J. "Evaluating a President," *AGB Reports*, volume 17, number 5, (March/April 1975).

Kauffman, Joseph F. Presidential Assessment and Development." *New Directions in Higher Education: Developing and Evaluating Administrative Leadership*. Edited by Charles F. Fisher. No. 22. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1978.

Munitz, Barry. "Reviewing Presidential Leadership." *Handbook of College and University Trusteeship*. Edited by Richard T. Ingram. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1980.

_____. *Leadership in College and University Assessment and Search*. Oak Brook, Ill.: Johnson Associates, Inc., 1977.

Nason, John W. *Presidential Search: A Guide to the Process of Selecting and Appointing College and University Presidents*. Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards, 1979. Chapters 3 and 8.

Chapter 7

The President's Self-Assessment

The logical place to begin an evaluation is with the president's statement of stewardship or self-assessment of performance in office. This is customary, though by no means universal, in formal evaluations. It is a device less apt to be used in informal ones. Trustees would be well advised to call for such statements more often than they do. It amounts to the president's analysis of institutional needs and goals and of his or her success in meeting the needs and achieving the goals.

Reasons for Self-Assessment

1. Presidents should be judged on *established* criteria, preferrably criteria settled in advance, but certainly criteria acceptable to the president. One way—and an important way—of arriving at such criteria is to ask the president to set them, after which the trustees will undoubtedly want to revise them.

2. This can be a highly salutary exercise for the president. Bogged down in administrative details, preoccupied with immediate problems, torn by the competing demands for time from different constituencies, the president needs occasionally to take stock of institutional needs and presidential performance. An occasional bout of soul searching can be good for the soul—and for the institution.

3. A thoughtful job of institutional analysis and self-analysis by the chief executive officer can be highly illuminating to the trustees. As institutional operations

grow more complex, as traditional ends change and untested means to achieve those ends are tried, it becomes increasingly difficult for trustees to form accurate judgments about the president's performance.[1] A statement of stewardship can be both helpful and revealing.

4. There is a subtle but real psychological advantage to the president when he or she is the first to point out various failures or weaknesses. It takes the uncomfortable edge off criticisms from others if the president can say: "Yes, I realize that I neglected that problem or failed in such-and-such a respect. I pointed it out in my self-assessment." It is easier to go on and say: "I have already indicated that I intended to give the matter top priority in the next two years," or "I think it doubtful that I shall ever be successful in that area, and you (trustees) will have to decide whether you want to replace me with someone who will be."

What Self-Assessment Should Include

Sketches of what an institutional and personal balance sheet should look like are to be found in the four procedural outlines in Appendix B. An excellent format is to be found in the "Procedural Guidelines for the Evaluation of Presidents" issued by the chancellor's office of the City University of New York. It reads:

"In preparing the statement of self-assessment, the president might wish to include, but not limit him/herself to, the following:

a. A resume of expectations and objectives held on the assumption of office.
b. The degree to which such expectations and objectives held true or were achieved.
c. An assessment of the major factors which altered expectations and objectives, and in the manner in which they changed.
d. An assessment of the mechanisms used to redefine goals and objectives and the degree to which they led to achieving redefined goals.
e. A description of major areas of institutional concern over the next five years.
f. A description of possible institutional changes that might address areas of future concern.
g. A statement of goals and objectives which the president would like to achieve during the next two years."

One statewide system used a device by which the president was asked to rate himself or herself on the same set of questions to be used by others. The second part of this questionnaire contained a series of questions addressed only to the president regarding accomplishments, failures, working style, satisfactions and future plans.

In one private college the trustee committee requested the president to complete the following "Management Review."

—I—

a. Describe your most significant achievement in relation to your objectives as you perceived them when you accepted your appointment as president.

b. Describe any difficulties you encountered in achieving these objectives.
c. Describe modifications you made (if any) in your objectives as originally perceived, the reason(s) for modification, the difficulties encountered in making the modification, and the significant results of the modifications.
d. What aspects of your presidency are the most interesting and rewarding to you? Why?
e. What aspects of your presidency are the least interesting or most difficult for you? Why?
f. What would you like to be doing as president of _____ College that you are not doing now?

—II—

a. What activities have contributed to your personal development since assuming the presidency of _____ College?
b. What are your short-term personal development objectives and what plans do you have to accomplish them?
c. What are your longer range goals?

—III—

Please express any additional thoughts, desires, ambitions or plans you have as president of _____ College.

Statements of stewardship vary greatly in style and length. They can be as brief as a five or six page letter to the board chairman or to the chancellor of the system. They can stretch to 40 or 50 pages. The new SUNY guidelines suggest that they be limited to not more than 20 pages.

Whatever the length, it is clear that such self-assessments have proved of great value to boards of trustees and committees of evaluation. For the most part they are made public, for they have great educational value for all constituencies and provide an excellent basis for individual appraisals.

1. The authors of *Evaluating Our Performance* describe well the problem for postsecondary as well as private school education in their comment: "In 'Presidential Evaluation' Barry Munitz comments that any head today is caught between rising expectations of accountability and declining flexibility of action. According to Munitz, the more complex any institution becomes, and the more diffuse its focus of decision making the harder it gets for the head to determine how good a job he or she is doing. At the same time, it becomes more and more difficult for the individual trustee to upgrade casual observations to a usefully accurate appraisal of the top administrator's performance." (Boston, Mass.: National Association of Independent Schools, 1978), p. 8.

Additional Readings

Manitz, Barry. "Reviewing Presidential Leadership." *Handbook of College and University Trusteeship.* Edited by Richard T. Ingram. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1980.

National Association of Independent Schools. *Evaluating Our Performance.* Boston: 1978.

Chapter 8

How Others View the President

Evaluation of presidential performance is a responsibility of the trustees. Occasionally a mixed committee, similar in composition to the selection committee, will be assigned the task, as we noted in Chapter 5.[1] Faculty and others can assist the trustees in collecting information (which will largely consist of the opinions and attitudes of constituent groups) and even in assessing the soundness of the information. It bears repeating, however, that the final decision is one the trustees must make.

Sources of Evidence

On what kinds of evidence do trustees base their judgment about the president's performance? Many rely on their own direct contact with the president and the operations of the college or university. They observe the president at board and committee meetings where he or she discusses plans and problems. They read his or her reports on various aspects of the institution's operations. They examine the actual record of performance. They listen to speeches. They watch the president interact with alumni, parents, donors, state officials and distinguished guests. The perceptive observer can learn a lot about the cut of a person's jib in this way.

And then there are all the stories and rumors which flutter around every person in authority and which seem to proliferate in self-contained academic communities. The active, responsible and sensitive trustee

is bound to hear all sorts of things about "the administration." The president is constantly being judged, as we noted in Chapter 1, and those judgments have a way of filtering back to the governing board. Unfortunately, much of this hearsay evidence is wrong. The original story may have been based on misinformation, and it grows even more wide of the mark by frequent telling.

The difference between informal and formal evaluations is not that one is based on subjective impressions and the other on objective evidence. In general terms it is the difference between judgments based on haphazard and often inadequate information about the president's peformance and relations with members of the college or university community and judgments based on painstaking and systematic efforts to collect and assess the evidence.

Pros and Cons of Polling

Presidents cannot be properly assessed in isolation. They must be seen in relation to faculty, staff, students, alumni, state officers and the general public. "Members of the faculty," writes Anderson, "are perhaps the quickest to criticize and the last to praise, but their perspectives on presidents and administrators must be known if a proper evaluation is to occur."[2] Even if their perceptions of the president and his or her actions are wrong, they form a part of the social and psychological matrix within which the president operates. The judgments of administrative colleagues are equally important and much better informed. Students, alumni and others off-campus see less of the president, but their reactions are nevertheless part of the institutional climate. A reasonably thorough and honest evaluation, according to many who have been involved in the process, must include opinions and attitudes from the various constituencies with whom the president works. This being so, there is much to be said for systematic rather than haphazard methods of collecting that evidence.

And yet, the consequences may be disastrous. How does one invite faculty or student or alumni opinion without turning the whole business into a popularity contest? The president of a private college defended their informal procedure with the comment: "Generally speaking, we shy away from any broad-based formal participation by faculty, students, alumni, etc. because of the diversive and divisive 'Roman Circus' potential." The former head of a statewide system opposed formal evaluations on the grounds that no president who did anything significant would command the support of the faculty after six or seven years. In theory, student opinion should also be considered, but many respondents (though not all) reported that students had been the least satisfactory due to the fact that most did not know the president or understand the obligations of the office.

The president's job, as we noted in Chapter 1, is more complex than most people realize. It is also more precarious in that support for one program or group or idea is frequently seen as (and sometimes is) denial of support for others. Self-interest combines with inadequate knowledge to

distort judgments of worth. The chancellor of a statewide system after an elaborate and systematic evaluation of one of the presidents recommended a simpler and more flexible approach in the future. "It produced judgments," he wrote, "which appear to reflect vested interests of the evaluators; it sought judgments from many persons who believe themselves too remote from the president to judge him; it took far too long; it was expensive in terms of the time of the committee members; and possibly most serious, it failed to elicit responses from a sufficiently large sample to establish confidence that the results actually reflect the views of the faculty and students."[3]

Techniques of Inquiry

On the assumption that the opinions of various constituencies are to be sought, two interrelated questions immediately arise — who and how.

Let us begin with the size and character of the sample. A few committees broadcast their invitations to participate. Let anyone who has anything to say about the president say it, or write it. The result is apt to be an indiscriminate mixture of comments, but what is worse, it is likely to be skewed by the tendency of critics to be more vocal than those who support the administration.

Much more common is the use of selected individuals as targets of inquiry. These might be quite restricted as in the third case study described in Appendix A, section four. Or the number may be quite large, as is the practice in the City University of New York. While the assessment team in the CUNY has a certain amount of freedom to develop its own procedures, it must function within a framework established in the guidelines. The relevant one reads: "In addition to written documents, the assessment team will be expected to obtain a broadly representative sampling of opinions on the president's performance from various constituencies within the college. These include the faculty and student governing bodies; community advisory committees; representatives of the university faculty and student senates; departmental chairpersons; members of the administrative staff of the college. Views should also be sought from nonteaching professionals and representative leaders of clerical and service personnel on the campus. In addition, the evaluation team should solicit opinions from central university staff, the chancellor and members of the board of higher education."[4]

Each committee will need to decide how broad a sample time and good sense dictate. Broad participation may have the advantage of strengthening morale on campus, but in terms of substantive judgments a few well selected faculty, students active in student affairs, and alumni officers will in most cases serve as well as, if not better than, large numbers. In addition, the inclusion of people who are less involved in the governance of the college or university and who are less likely to have informed opinions on the performance of the president can easily distort the results. Note case study eight in section four of Appendix A.

It is not unusual for committees that pick their respondents carefully to accept com-

ments from others who feel moved to put their views on the record. Occasionally a committee will decline such proffered advice, but on the whole it is better to allow anyone with a strong concern to present his or her opinion. Such opinions must clearly be weighed carefully against the views of the selected participants and not allowed by sheer numbers to distort the conclusions.

Just as committees must choose to whom to turn for advice, so they must decide how to make their inquiries. Should they develop questionnaires, relying on written responses and comments? Should they concentrate on interviews with individuals or groups? Or should they do both? The decision will depend in part on the number of people to be consulted, but there are other considerations which should be weighed carefully.

Questionnaires can be short or long, open-ended or highly specific, different for different groups, used as we have seen with all members of a group or only with selected members. The two examples at the end of Chapter 6 and item three in Appendix C illustrate the open-ended approach. Examples four and five, on the other hand, require ratings on specific questions about performance. Some questionnaires have run to 100 items, and this raises the issues of how much is too much and whether all the questions are really necessary to arrive at a satisfactory assessment. Some committees found the workload excessive, especially when different questionnaires were constructed and the results computed for different constituencies.

Two examples of community college questionnaires are included in Appendix C—see items six and seven. One was developed by Herbert E. Phillips, president of Lake City Community College in Florida, and widely used by community colleges in the state. The other is a more elaborate instrument designed by James L. Wattenbarger, director of the Institute of Higher Education at the University of Florida, W. Dean Evans, vice president of Delaware County Community College in Media, Pennsylvania, and G.L. Mears, director of institutional studies at the University of Arkansas.[6]

The committee at one private college created two questionnaires—one focusing on the president's style of action, which went to her administrative colleagues, and the other concentrating on substantive issues of financial control, enrollments, development of a sense of mission and the like, which went to members of the board.

The board of a state system experimented with a double-pronged questionnaire. The usual questions were asked, and both the president and the members of the board were requested to provide ratings, so that it became possible to compare the way the president rated himself with the way the trustees judged his performance.

In yet another institution, faculty were requested to rate the president first on a scale of ideal performance and then on a scale of actual performance. At a midwestern private college faculty were again asked to rate the president on actual performance and then to indicate whether that performance on each item was worse, the same as,

or better over the five-year span the president had been in office. In this institution the faculty were also asked to rank by order of importance the various aspects of the president's activities about which questions were being asked.

Good questionnaires — i.e., those which ask no more than is necessary, which avoid ambiguous questions and loaded questions, and which provide in the answers the kind of information needed — are not easy to construct. Committees would do well to get competent advice and to test their instruments before wide use.[6] We have already noted that committees should ask themselves whether each question is relevant and important. They need also to ask whether the individuals to whom the form is being sent are in a position to give intelligent and informed responses. Several committees reported that student replies had proved of limited value due to the slight contact of the respondents with the president. And, as noted in the eighth case history in section four of Appendix A, the inclusion of student replies may have distorted the results.

A classic example of the wrong way to ask questions is provided in the experience of a state college committee. Instead of asking whether the president does or does not do certain things, or even whether the faculty respondent approves or disapproves of the president's actions or attitudes, the questionnaire requested faculty to indicate whether they were "highly dissatisfied," "moderately dissatisfied," or "highly satisfied" with the way the president dealt with such issues as promotion, salary, leaves and the like. Under the best of circumstances a faculty member who did not receive all he or she thought to be deserved would be inclined to indicate dissatisfaction. In this particular situation the president was under mandate from the central administration to reduce the number of faculty positions and to operate on a reduced budget — a situation calculated to enflame faculty hostility. The fact that the president survived the evaluation with the overall support of the faculty was a testimony to his ability and personality. He clearly survived in spite of and not because of the instrument devised for his evaluation.

One additional word of caution is in order. The variety of rating scales submitted by the respondents was extraordinary. Some used words, as in the example just cited. Some rated by numbers, some by letters; some proceeded from good to bad, others from unacceptable to highly acceptable. Some remind one of the definition of the camel as a horse designed by a committee. If everyone understands precisely what is wanted, no harm is done; but some scales seem so complicated that one wonders whether the respondents really understood what was being asked. Simplicity is a great, if sometimes neglected, virtue.

The chief alternative to the use of questionnaires is the interview. As a technique interviewing has many advantages. It makes possible much greater depth of insight. Ambiguities and uncertainties can be probed. The position from which the respondent colors his or her answers becomes clearer, so that the interviewer can interpret

specific judgments against the background from which they emerge.

Interviews, however, are time-consuming, and this means that people interviewed must be carefully selected. A limited sample is not in itself a bad thing so long as it is carefully balanced. Both the selection and the interviewing need to be skillfully done. It is difficult to believe, for example, that significant areas of inquiry can be seriously examined in interviews scheduled at ten-minute intervals, as at least one evaluation did, meeting with 18 individuals between eleven in the morning and three in the afternoon with an hour out for lunch. Interviewers should be knowledgeable people possessing to a high degree the quality of discretion. Barry Munitz cites as one of the lessons learned from his extensive experience in this field: "Survey instruments are far less important than sophisticated interviewers and interview procedures. The ability to ask the right question and to gauge the nature of the response becomes one of the primary skills required for any internal or external evaluation leader."[7]

Quite often both questionnaires and interviews are used. The former provide a certain breadth of coverage, the latter more depth. On the whole, the evidence from our survey suggests that interviews when carefully conducted provide more satisfactory results. This is particularly true when a professional consultant or consultants are involved in the evaluation. Their potential role must be considered in any discussion of the techniques of assessment; but before we turn to them a caution must be raised regarding the approach to faculty, students and others with a request for information about the president. This can be taken as an invitation to a witch hunt or a public censure or the prelude to the president's dismissal. Responses, unless the inquiry warns against it, may concentrate on some recent incident rather than appraise a three- or five-year span of activity. Boards and their committees need to be extremely careful not to undermine the position and authority of the president by seeming to encourage such interpretations. It is of the utmost importance that the notice to faculty and others be judiciously worded. The invitation to respond to a questionnaire or to take part in an interview should set the atmosphere and backdrop for the drama. Appendix C contains three samples of letters used by committees to defuse any alarms.

The Use of Consultant(s)

To take the pulse of an academic community requires an understanding of the special characteristics of the academic world, familiarity with the local scene and sensitivity to human strengths and foibles. Small colleges where the trustees maintain close relations with the campus and its people and where there is mutual understanding and trust should not require the professional consultant, though even they may find the use of outside help a real advantage. The large and complex university, however, is another matter. Even the well informed trustee or regent will often be at a loss in the morass of competing pressures from separate campuses or divisions or schools. The

professional educator from the outside with experience at other institutions will be in a stronger position to interpret conflicting statements and confusing evidence. This will also be the case where there are underlying problems of governance or organization or personnel that block the normal path of resolution. So, too, where trustees lack experience or where distrust is endemic.

The advantages of using a consultant or a team of consultants deserve careful consideration. To begin with, it can save a substantial amount of trustee time. Formal evaluations require considerable time if they are to be done well, more time in fact than many trustees can afford to give. Where this is the case, it makes sense to pay a consultant to carry the burden. Less obvious but more important is the consultant's role as confidant. Trustees can express their concern about the institution or the president or the administrative team more readily to an outside expert than to a member of the family. Faculty may feel more comfortable with such a person. Above all the president may feel freer to discuss problems, personal or institutional, with someone who can serve as a kind of father confessor. And finally there is the advantage of perspective. "Time and money can be saved," writes Munitz, "if the board has access to an experienced professional who has broad knowledge of the situations at other colleges and universities, who is acquainted with the latest developments in institutional assessment, and who can translate a mass of administrative data into information usable to trustees."[8] Furthermore, the consultant is freer to make recommendations that individuals with vested interests in the institution might be reluctant to make.

The use of consultants is growing with the increase in formal assessments of presidents.[9] Some institutions prefer to use a single consultant — an expert in educational administration with interest and experience in the problems of assessment. Others, such as CUNY and now SUNY, favor a team of three consultants. The revised guidelines for the latter require that "the chancellor shall consult with the president on the formation of a visiting team from a panel of selected college and university presidents, or comparably experienced peers, from outside of SUNY. The team shall number three, with the addition of a person who will serve as representative of the chancellor, ex-officio."

Consultants can play a major or minor role in the assessment, depending on the needs and preferences of those directly involved. Costs can run up to $8,000 if the consultant is asked to conduct an elaborate examination, but they are normally much less. Some consultants set an overall fee plus expenses for their services; others require a per diem plus expense payment. The amount of time and total cost can be approximated in advance and are subject to negotiation. Respondents in our survey who used consultants reported without exception that they found them well worth the expense, and several who tried to go it alone indicated that they would use consultants the next time. Trustees should not, however, substitute the consultant's judgments for their own.

1. In one community college where the chancellor of the state system was reluctant to conduct an evaluation, the president initiated his own assessment by requiring all college officers reporting directly to the president to complete a comprehensive evaluation form to be tabulated by the local office of institutional research. The president then used the results in group conferences with his management team as a means of improving both his and the team's performance.
2. G. Lester Anderson, "The Evaluation of Academic Administrators: Principles, Processes, and Outcomes" (University Park, Pa.: Pennsylvania State University, 1975). See also the chapter entitled "The Faculty Role in Administrator Evaluation" by Charles H. Farmer in *New Directions for Higher Education: Developing and Evaluating Administrative Leadership*, ed. by Charles F. Fisher, No. 22 (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1978).
3. Satish B. Parekh in "Presidential Evaluation Equals Long-Range Planning" describes the situation thus: "The trouble with such surveys is that they are like blind men examining an elephant. Some examine the legs while others examine the trunk. Each expresses what he finds worthy of praise or blame, but no two can agree on their assessments because no one has really seen the elephant." *Change Magazine*, May 1977.
4. In addition the faculty senate has established even more specific procedures about which faculty officers and official groups must be included; and while these are not mandatory on the visiting team, they are for the most part honored.
5. A covering article by the three authors outlining procedures which include the use of the questionnaire is to be found in *Community and Junior College Journal*, February 1979, "Who's Evaluating the President?"
6. On the other hand, committees should look sceptically at local educational psychologists and alleged survey research experts who like nothing better than to spend six months designing the perfect questionnaire. Much time is wasted in the process, and the end product may be more complex than circumstances require.
7. "Strengthening Institutional Leadership" in *Developing and Evaluating Administrative Leadership*, ed. by Charles F. Fisher, p. 17.
8. *Op. cit.*, p. 18.
9. In addition to individual consultants, the Presidential Search and Assessment Service cosponsored by the AGB and the Association of American Colleges provides experienced counsel in presidential assessment.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Additional Readings

Anderson, G. Lester. "The Evaluation of Academic Administrators: Principles, Processes, and Outcomes." University Park, Pa.: Pennsylvania State University, 1975.

Farmer, Charles H. "The Faculty Role in Administrator Evaluation." *New Directions for Higher Education: Developing and Evaluating Administrative Leadership*. Edited by Charles F. Fisher. No. 22. Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1978.

Munitz, Barry. "Strengthening Educational Leadership." *Developing and Evaluating Administrative Leadership*.

_____. "Presidential Evaluation: An Assessment of Institutional Leadership." Washington, D.C.: Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, 1976.

_____. *Leadership in Colleges and Universities: Assessment and Search*. Oak Brook, Ill.: Johnson Associates, Inc., 1977.

Parekh, Satish B. "Presidential Evaluation Equals Long-Range Planning." *Change Magazine*, May 1977.

Wattenbarger, James L.; Evans, N. Dean and Moore, G.L. "Who's Evaluating the President?" *Community and Junior College Journal*, February 1979.

Chapter 9

First and Last Thoughts: Summary and Conclusions

Evaluation as a public exercise is a relatively recent development. As a result there is no clearly established pattern of procedure. Indeed, any reader of the preceding chapters can hardly be blamed for feeling bewildered by the wide range of options. It may be useful, therefore, to emphasize the main issues discussed up to this point and to provide a summary for the reader interested in a concise overview of this complex issue.

The Highlights of Assessment

1. The performance of college and university presidents always has been and always will be judged. This is a fact of life which is a consequence of the sensitive and influential role which presidents play. The issue is not whether presidents will be evaluated, but how they will be evaluated and by whom. The past decade has seen a pronounced trend toward more formal assessments. Both the causes and the extent of this trend are examined in Chapter 1.

2. The choice of procedures should be dictated by the purpose or purposes that the board hopes to achieve by the evaluation. The more significant purposes are to fulfill trustee responsibility for making certain that the institution is well managed, to help the president improve his or her performance, to review and improve institutional governance, and to make certain that sound institutional goals are being pursued. Less

important purposes — by-products, as it were, of the major ones — are to educate trustees and the academic community to the complexities of the president's job, to decide whether to retain or to fire the president, to set an example for the evaluation of administrative officers and faculty, and to determine the president's compensation.

Procedures may range from the completely casual to the highly structured. They may be virtually continuous, intermittent or scheduled for regular intervals. Although there is no clear dividing line, evaluations, beyond the traditional, regular and highly desirable interaction between board members and the chief executive officer, fall into two general classes — the informal and the formal.

Informal assessments tend to be frequent, say once a year, and are usually made by the trustees either on the basis of their first-hand knowledge of the president or on that knowledge plus impressions formally acquired from the faculty, administrative officers, alumni and students. The assessment is a private and confidential affair between the trustees and the president.

Formal evaluations, on the other hand, are always characterized by three features. They occur — except, perhaps, for the first time — at regularly scheduled intervals. These may be once a year, but in the majority of cases they fall every three, four or five years. In contrast to the informal, almost hearsay, practice of learning what others think, formal assessments involve an organized and systematic effort to get "objective evidence" in terms of what other constituencies think about the president's performance. Finally, formal evaluations are public events. They are known by faculty and students, state officials and often the general public, to be taking place. This can be disastrous or constructive, depending on the political climate both within and surrounding the institution and the skill with which the evaluation is conducted. For a more thorough comparison of informal and formal procedures see Chapters 2 and 3.

3. Chapter three explores the advantages and disadvantages of both formal and informal evaluations. Formal assessments, when properly conducted, can achieve seven of the eight purposes of the operation. They throw a spotlight on the governing structure of the college or university — the role and performance of the board, the adequacy of the administrative team, the authority of the faculty, the influence of a central office of a statewide system in addition to the actions and influence of the president. They provide an orderly and public way of reviewing the goals of the institution and of the president's success in steering the institution toward these goals. They can strengthen the president's position by defusing sporadic attacks, by enhancing his or her credibility and by creating a better understanding of the president's job. They help trustees and regents to recognize their role and responsibilities.

The critics of formal assessments focus on their disadvantages — or at least their alleged disadvantages. It is argued that the president holds a unique position in the academic

scheme of things and that his or her authority and prestige, the capacity to lead, would be undermined by public examination. It is further argued that modern problems and conditions have tended to make the president's role more political than educational and that formal evaluations would simply complete the politicization of the office. Presidents would be under pressure to decide issues on grounds of popularity rather than on what would be best for the institution. Since public scrutiny and criticism are always uncomfortable, presidents will sometimes resign rather than endure formal evaluations or, having survived the ordeal, will at once look around for another place. In either case the result is shortened tenure in office. And finally, it is always alleged, periodic formal evaluations are cop-outs. They are a device by which boards evade their proper responsibility for constant monitoring of the president's performance by passing the buck to others.

4. The advocates of informal procedures point out that such assessments keep the trustees in control as they should be. Since they are conducted in a quiet, behind-the-scenes manner, they do not tend to become major issues dividing faculty and others along "party lines." They take into account the very special relation between the president and the governing board, a relation of mutual interdependence which is jeopardized by the atmosphere of public investigation.

According to the critics, however, informal assessments tend to be too casual—more pretense than substance. They are haphazard in that no systematic attempt is made to discover how the various constituencies react to the president. The criteria for judgment are rarely stated. They leave the president in an exposed position, subject to constant or intermittent attacks, particularly when some decision or incident has aroused violent opposition. Nor do they normally pay much attention to the major objectives of evaluation, such as the pattern of governance and the institutional goals.

The ideal situation, more readily realized in private than in public institutions, is one in which trustees and president work together with complete understanding and trust, where the assessment of the president's performance is continuous and where the president can turn to the board at any time for advice and assistance.

5. The attitude of the board will determine the nature of the assessment. Some trustees are reluctant to do more than the bare minimum either because they believe anything more would spoil the beautiful relation between the president and themselves or because, having spent so much time and effort in selecting the president, they are reluctant to take any action that would force them to face the possibility of having to do it all over again. Indeed, many would like to help, but do not know how, or feel that they would be intruding upon the president in order to gain essential knowledge. These board members currently despair at simultaneously helping their own situation and helping the president.

For a successful assessment there needs to be a conscious intent to evaluate. The nature of the process will reflect both the interest of the board, the type and complexity of the institution and the temper of the campus. Whatever the process, it must begin with a board decision and remain under board control. Faculty, students and others may participate by consultation in presenting opinions; they should not be the major source of the ultimate evaluation. These issues are discussed in Chapter 4.

6. The purpose of the assessment should be, at its core, to help the president to improve his or her performance in office and in broader terms to improve the institution. This latter involves a critical look at board performance. Since the president is hedged about by faculty prerogatives as well as board authority, since his or her powers are limited by the competence of the other administrative officers and by central authority where the institution is part of a system, it is essential to review governance as a whole and not just the performance of the president. Furthermore, as already pointed out, performance needs to be seen in the light of institutional needs and goals which in turn may need to be reassessed and restated. From the president's point of view this takes the focus off his or her performance and helps the whole community to understand better the matrix of forces and inhibitions that compose the mosaic of academic governance.

7. Chapter 6 explores the need for choice for criteria by which judgement is made. The president's responsibilities may be stated in the bylaws or handbook. They may be specified at the time of appointment or, all too often, some time after appointment. They may be proposed by the president at the time an evaluation is being planned. Clearly the president should know on what standards he or she is being appraised, and it is highly desirable that these standards be agreed upon well in advance. Since different constituencies have different and often conflicting expectations of the president, it is important to get the criteria out into the open. Faculty may want a scholar; students, a hail-fellow-well-met and sports lover. If the trustees want a tough manager of a tightly run ship and a good fund raiser, the president may have to disappoint faculty and students, for the president is responsible to the trustees who set the demands. The normal range of criteria is to be found in Chapter 6.

8. Any formal evaluation and all but the most casual informal ones should begin with a self-assessment by the president or statement of stewardship. Where criteria of performance have not already been set, the president should be given the opportunity of saying what he or she considers to have been the major responsibilities of the office and how he or she has met them. This can be useful to the president who often has little time for stock taking, and useful to the trustees who get a fresh interpretation by the president of institutional needs and goals. There is also a real psychological

benefit to the president who can beat his or her critics to the punch, as it were, by pointing out faults or failures. It is heartening to be able to grasp the initiative and indicate areas where improvemnent is desired and specifically addressed. In a situation of considerable personal strain and constant public pressure it is a comfort to confess certain weaknesses, along with successes of course, before one's critics blow them out of proportion. See Chapter 7.

9. No man is an island unto himself, especially not the college or university president. He or she works daily with a wide variety of people — administrative officers, faculty, system executives, students, alumni, public officials, donors, parents. How the president gets along with these groups is one aspect of evaluation. The trustees, therefore, need to know how members of these groups react to the president. Some know from firsthand, intimate, continuing contacts. Some pick up misinformation and partial information through rumors, hearsay and random conversations. Surely it is better, so runs the argument, to get accurate information through systematic inquiry. But then the danger confronts us, how to avoid all the absurdities of a popularity poll? Few presidents are heroes to their faculties, and it is no coincidence that the colleges with excessive faculty control of policies have often suffered higher than normal presidential turnover.

Decisions must be made about whom to consult. Should it be all the faculty or selected representatives, all administrative staff or only those who work most closely with the president, all students or those with some knowledge of the president? Both inclusive and selective methods have been tried, and such evidence as we have favors the latter. How should opinions be obtained — through questionnaires or by interviews? Again both methods have been used and sometimes a combination of the two. Interviews may be more time-consuming, but they make it easier for the evaluation committee to keep control, they minimize the publicity, and they make it possible to explore issues in much greater depth. The problems of techniques are discussed in Chapter 8.

10. There is no consensus on how often evaluations should be made. Some boards prefer annual assesaments; others lean toward less frequent dates. There is some evidence that more frequent assessments tend to be perfunctory; but those who favor evaluations at four- and five-year intervals also want some kind of informal annual assessment.

There is, however, substantial agreement that the period of assessment should be quite limited. A few institutions have experimented with procedures stretching over a year and even longer, but the trend is toward limiting the period of investigation to two to four months. A longer time tends to make everyone upset and uncertain. Even the president who feels fairly confident experiences some anxiety while the evaluation is going on. The shorter and more quickly over, the better for all concerned.

11. The issue of openness versus confidentiality needs careful management. Both are important, and except for extreme situations they need not conflict. Individual judgments should be strictly guarded. They are private and confidential even in states with sunshine laws. The general results of the evaluation, however, require different treatment. They need not be made public when the assessment has been informal and conducted in quiet, behind-the-scene fashion. This is one of the advantages of the informal approach. The more formal and public the assessment becomes, on the other hand, the more important it is to publicize the conclusions. These conclusions may include important new directions and objectives for the institution, changes in the structure of governance, reaffirmation of trustee support for the president and recommendations for his or her future direction of effort. Some details may need to be handled in executive session, but a public announcement of the major points will answer legitimate questions and allay suspicions.

It should not need saying, though it apparently needs to be said, that the trustees, or chancellor in a statewide system, must always be open with the president. This is no place for conniving behind his or her back. The president must know that the board intends to conduct an evaluation. The president should be given every opportunity to participate in the planning of the evaluation. The president should get the full findings of the evaluation, some of which, as just noted, should be made public and some reserved for private consultation.

Conclusions and Recommendations

There is no single way, which is right or best, for assessing presidential performance. What works for one institution might be disastrous for another. Differences of type, of complexity, of temper, of governing structure dictate different methods of procedure. Each board must review its own situation, asking what it wants to accomplish by an evaluation, and given their precise set of conditions what procedure would be most effective and productive. One caution applies to all institutions. Avoid as far as possible initiating a review of the president's status and performance as the result of a sudden crisis. Sometimes boards, as we have noted, have little or no choice when storms blow up, but the atmosphere such storms create severely reduces the usefulness of the evaluation.

Although an increasing number of institutions are turning to formal evaluations, their disadvantages must be weighed against their advantages. The many arguments pro and con are to be found throughout this study. Formal assessments are certainly preferable to the casual procedures followed by many boards of trustees, but the continuous monitoring of the president's performance and the institution's progress by knowledgeable and responsible trustees is probably the ideal arrangement. This falls into the category of informal evaluations, but it is a far cry from the inadequate procedures which characterize most such ventures. Where trustees feel inadequate or unprepared for the heavy assignment of

continuous assessment, the outside consultant can be immensely helpful. In some situations the consultant becomes an invaluable and confidential counselor to the board or the trustee committee in planning the evaluation. In others the use of a consultant opens the process which becomes at once both public and formal. The outside consultant, however, as we suggested in Chapter 8, can avoid the worst dangers of a public hearing and trial.

The current trend is in the direction of more formal, which means more elaborate, evaluations. Many presidents, including some who do not look upon formal assessments with favor, believe that they are here to stay. The current trend toward their use may turn out to be a passing fad. Trustees may discover that the time and energy and psychic cost are disproportionate to the advantages. Trustees are becoming much more knowledgeable about their institutions and their responsibilities, and the advantages of a consciously planned program of continuous assessment are becoming more obvious.

Insofar as formal evaluations continue to appeal to a significant number of boards in the years immediately ahead, it is important that they be done right. Even evaluations which would be classified as informal can profit from the experience of other institutions. To be done properly presidential assessments should include the following ingredients.

1. A consciously planned design which is clear about the purposes to be achieved and the methods used. Such a plan should be developed in cooperation with the president; it should not be forced on him or her. Presidential assessment is a very human affair. It deals with the professional and personal life of the president. The attitude and behavior of the president's spouse and the nature of the presidential household affect the president's performance. They are a part of the picture and provide an additional reason why the assessment needs to be conducted with understanding of and sensitivity to the position in which the president is placed. Ideally the plan should be agreed upon at the time of appointment if not already by bylaw or precedent.

2. An appraisal of all aspects of governance. The president is only one of the actors, with a central and important role, but a limited one at best. A truly constructive evaluation must include the role of the governing board, the performance of all administrative officers, the prerogatives of the faculty, the rights of students, and, in statewide systems, the authority of the central office. A review of board responsibilities and performance could well precede the evaluation of the president. Neither can be successfully completed without the other. One of the major causes of apprehension on the part of presidents is the fear that their performance will be judged by people who do not really understand the nature of the job. Therefore, it becomes important to make sure that trustees do understand the complexities and limitations of the modern president's position. It is obviously unfair to hold the president responsible for actions

or failures to act in situations in which he or she has neither authority nor power.

3. The full participation of the president has already been emphasized, and one important aspect of that participation is a presidential self-assessment. Such a statement of goals conceived, progress toward them and objectives for the future helps trustees to see the president's task in perspective and can set new goals for the institution. It is a salutory exercise for the president: Daily pressures and commitments often prevent him or her from seeing the academic woods for the managerial trees.

4. Public opinion about the president's performance is relevant, but should be sought under carefully controlled conditions, if at all. Campus rumors and hearsay evidence should be viewed with suspicion. The solicitations of the opinions of faculty, students, alumni and others should be done on a selective, not a broadcast, basis. Anything resembling a popularity poll should be avoided. Interviews are more revealing than questionnaires, well worth the extra time and effort. The use of outside consultant(s), familiar with the educational terrain, is particularly helpful at this stage.

5. Control throughout the assessment process must remain in the hands of the trustees and must be understood by all parties to belong there. Faculty and other constituencies have a part to play in the selection of college and university presidents; mixed committees of search and selection are becoming the standard procedures. Such committees can be useful in soliciting information about an incumbent president, but their function should not extend beyond that and in most instances it is better to focus the gathering of information in a trustee committee. The president has been appointed by the board. He or she serves at the pleasure of the board. The president is responsible to faculty, students, staff and others only in the indirect sense of guiding and managing an enterprise in which they can realize their proper functions. It is to the governing board that the president has direct and primary responsibility.

6. The more formal and public the evaluation, the more important it becomes to give some public account of the board's conclusions. This may be no more than the general statement that the board has reviewed the president's performance after five years in office (or three or four) and feels that the institution is singularly fortunate to have President X at its helm. Or it may be a much more elaborate statement outlining procedures followed, weaknesses as well as strengths found in the governing structure, new objectives for the institution and new assignments for the president. It helps the president and the institution to have the air cleared. Negative findings that would be embarrassing to the president or members of the staff should be dealt with privately, but many criticisms of the president and of the administration as a whole can be publicly stated. After all, no one is perfect, and no president can possibly be

all of the things and do all the things that are often expected.

7. The ultimate purpose of the evaluation is to help the president and to strengthen the institution. It is therefore preferable to separate the assessment from decisions regarding the reappointment of the president or changes in compensation. Decisions on continuation in office and level of compensation presuppose judgments of competence and review of performance. But the real value of presidential assessment is lost sight of when the process is closely tied to these practical issues. The purpose is to help the president see where he or she is doing well and where ill, how his or her contribution to the institution's leadership and management can be improved, what goals or new emphases will be important in the next three to five years, and how they can best be achieved. It follows from this that both the president and the governing board need to take action on the recommendations resulting from the assessment. Presidents can change. They can concentrate on new issues and within limits they can change their style of action. And if weaknesses in the governing structure are revealed by the evaluation, the exercise is largely wasted unless steps are taken to improve the structure.

There is a widespread belief that the job of the college or university president has in the past two decades become so complex and difficult that good men and women are no longer willing to serve. Even a casual inspection of the current academic scene indicates that highly qualified and deeply dedicated men and women are serving as presidents. What we do not know is how many others like them might be serving if conditions were different. Trustees would be wise to make the job as attractive as possible and to conserve the investments they have made in selecting present incumbents. The problem is not how to get rid of presidents, but how to keep them and to help them grow. The assessment of presidential performance, in whatever form, is ultimately justifiable only when it achieves this purpose.

Appendix A

A Spectrum of Examples

The seemingly balanced advantage and disadvantages of formal vs. informal assessments make the choice among methods difficult. Perhaps it will help to examine a number of actual procedures. The following concrete cases vary from the very simple to the extremely complex and they exhibit the advantages and weaknesses of different approaches.

The Casual Approach

Some governing boards confess — or boast — that they do relatively little by way of assessing the performance of their chief executive officer. They may, of course, do more than they are aware of doing — or they may do less. Their attitudes and actions are marked by a certain casualness, the flavor of which can best be appreciated from the descriptions offered by their chairmen.

"We do not do this in an organized way. There is a general awareness on the part of some trustees — particularly those on the executive committee — as to the perceived status of things. Any advice or cautions which seem necessary are communicated to the president informally by the chairman." *(A private university)*

"The president of the university is required to give reports to the board of trustees at each of its meetings and at the meetings of its executive committee. These reports

take the form of state-of-the-university presentations. Although the reports are not used specifically for evaluative purposes, they serve as an indicator of the president's effectiveness as chief executive officer." *(A private university)*

"Presidential performance is evaluated not only monthly but almost on a weekly basis by the board in an informal method. With a fairly small board of nine elected members, we find that formal evaluation procedures would be unduly time-consuming and not that productive." *(A state university)*

By constant contact and close relationship in committee and board meetings." *(A private college)*

Such evidence as we were able to obtain suggests that two-year colleges were less inclined to be casual in their evaluations of the administration and more inclined toward annual reviews tied in with revisions in salaries.

Informal But Planned

The next segment of the spectrum includes institutions where the boards think of their procedures as informal, but where some kind of deliberate effort is made to assess the president's performance. The evaluation is not incidental, or accidental, to the board's activities. It is recognized as an appropriate trustee responsibility, and someone — the chairman, a committee, individual trustees or the board as a whole — engaged in a conscious effort to discharge the obligation.

Some of the procedures are so elaborate and so institutionalized that they might easily be classed as formal, but they all have one characteristic in common. They limit the assessment to members of the governing board. No effort is made, at least no organized effort, to test the view of other members of the academic community. Classification becomes somewhat an arbitrary matter. The community college that annually appoints one of its trustees to discuss with other trustees the president's performance and report back to the full board describes its procedure as formal. Most respondents, however, would view this as an informal procedure.

Here are some of the methods used by different types of institutions. All are considered informal by the participants.

"We can advise that our president is appointed for a six-year term; however, the board evaluates the president at the end of each year of his term informally at each member's preference. Some of the board members make their evaluation in writing; others do it informally in a special executive session with the president so that the benefit of each of the evaluations is shared with the other members of the board." *(A public university)*

"The performance of the president is reviewed by the executive and

finance committees in a regular meeting every year when the president's compensation is considered on the recommendation of the chairman and officers of the board. This has been found to be an adequate procedure for over 20 years." *(A public university)*

"Administrative committee reviews president's role continually. Annually in executive session the board reviews the president's performance after which the chairman of the board discusses any needs with the president." *(Private college)*

"Annually, the president meets with the chairman and vice chairman of the board, plus the retired chairman of the board, to discuss frankly and informally his performance for the past year and his viewpoints regarding the year(s) ahead. The board for years has entrusted to this group the establishment of the president's compensation for the ensuing year. Also, in my opinion this is a far superior procedure to a rigidified and detailed analysis/evaluation of a president's performance, which is quite difficult to measure in this way." *(Private college)*

"Chancellor presents annual report and self-evaluation to board for critique in executive session." *(Community college)*

"Once a year our board reviews overall projections for coming year. At that time the board gets together to informally review the president's efforts and achievements. Then we grant raises, fringe benefits and extend his contract if we concur with the conditions for the previous year." *(Community college)*

Formal or Informal? Borderline Cases

When evaluations include some attempt to determine how the president stands in the eyes of the academic community, they meet one of the criteria of formal procedures. They may, however, be so unstructured that they are thought of by those involved as informal. Thus, the chairman of a private college in the East speaks of a close association between the trustees and the president through committee activity and of an annual assessment of the president's performance at the annual meeting with its review of institutional finances and objectives. To make clear that this judgment is not limited to trustee reactions he adds: "The student leaders meet with board members throughout the year, as do faculty members. The board, collectively, feels that it has rapport with the different segments of the school's community." At an institution on the west coast the president is given a four-year term with an evaluation in the third year. This includes consultation "with deans and other administrative officers" followed by an executive committee review and recommendation to the full board with specific attention to "financial stability, fund raising success, caliber of appointments, strength of

the artistic/academic programs and relationships with the various constituencies: board, faculty, staff, students." In both of these examples the procedure is characterized by the respondents as informal.

The chief executive officer of one statewide system makes annual recommendations regarding individual presidents to the executive committee of the board which in turn makes recommendations to the full board. In addition, writes the chairman, "the members of the board visit each campus twice a year (every semester). During these visits, which last all day, the trustees hold three meetings. One is with the student leaders, one is with the faculty, and one is with the administrative leaders." He describes their procedures as "informal but thorough."

The same could be said for the procedure used by a private eastern college. The chairman describes it as follows:

> "Every two or three years a very small subcommittee of the executive committee (usually the vice chairman of the board and the chairman of the executive committee) reviews our entire administrative structure and staff. This is done with the full approval and cooperation of our president.
>
> "The procedure used is as follows: They spend several days on the campus interviewing all our top administrative personnel, a number of their subordinates and a scattering of faculty members. Casual informal discussions are conducted almost on a random basis with students, but there are no formal interviews with students.
>
> "We have found this procedure to be very valuable both in evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of the presidential performance and in evaluating our whole administrative structure, what supporting services and personnel the president needs (and doesn't need), what tasks can be delegated and how, etc. Many helpful suggestions have come out of the process, and festering complaints or grievances (if any) surface quickly and can be dealt with before they become serious.
>
> "Although the small subcommittee does report to the executive committee (in executive session) our experience has been that the process is usually more effective than the report in making our administrative personnel as effective as possible."

Less elaborate than this is the procedure followed at a private college in the Midwest, but nevertheless designated as formal. At this institution the president is serving a third six-year term. Near the end of the first and second terms the chairman asked the officially elected faculty observer on the board to make a quick check with faculty respecting the reappointment of the president. The faculty observer talked with leading members of the faculty on the first occasion and asked department chairmen

to report on the consensus of their departments on the second. The quickly assembled judgments were then reported to the board chairman, and the president was reappointed at the next board meeting.

The procedure followed at a community college in a state with sunshine laws provides another example of a fairly simple process, yet reported as formal. Every other year the chairman appoints a member of the board as evaluator (usually the past chairman) who mails out to his or her colleagues a request for an assessment of the president's performance, usually in the form of a simple questionnaire. The evaluator is encouraged to talk with faculty, students and staff, but does not always do so. After compiling the results of these inquiries, the evaluator reviews them with the president and subsequently presents his report at an open meeting of the board, at which the trustees discuss the findings and decide on their recommendations.

Full-Dress Evaluations

The following examples are all classified as formal evaluations. They are periodic rather than continuous or intermittent. They are not limited to the governing board, but involve judgments from other segments of the academic community. They are public events, known throughout the academic community to be occurring and consequently the object of considerable interest. They have been chosen to illustrate different techniques and varying results. For the most part they are success stories, but two or three left much to be desired.

a. A midwestern private college. In recent years, primarily at the urging of the chairman of the board, an annual management-by-objectives procedure has been used to assess the performance of the president. At the beginning of each new academic year the president presents his major objectives for the year ahead to the board chairman. Discussion results in an agreed set of priorities. The president uses a similar procedure with his chief administrative officers.

At the end of the academic year the president presents a written report on the year's accomplishments. This self-assessment relates not only to the specific objectives established for the year, but also to four general areas of presidential responsibility:

(1) Long-range and operational planning
(2) Financial control and use of assets
(3) Selection and management of people
(4) Progress made in developing innovative approaches to higher education.

This assessment of accomplishments is then reviewed and discussed by an appraisal committee which consists of the officers of the board plus the chairman of the faculty advisory committee, the chairman of the staff advisory committee, and the president of the student government. The last three report on behalf of their respective groups, being left to their own devices to determine the sentiment of their groups. Apparently no attempt is made to poll the members.

The appraisal committee reviews its findings with the president and reports them to the board. The board discusses the recommendations in executive session, determines the president's salary for the following year,

and the chairman follows this up with a personal conference with the president.

This is a relatively simple system calculated to make certain that progress toward institutional goals is on everyone's mind. The chairman thinks that "the process gives the board a reasonably accurate estimate of how the president is doing." The president finds it "helpful and constructive."

b. A large state university. At the time of his original appointment the president proposed that in the fifth year, i.e., after his administrative pattern and style had been established, his performance in office be evaluated. Accordingly, the chairman appointed at the beginning of the fifth year a presidential assessment committee consisting of the chairman, the vice chairman and the past chairman, who had also been chairman of the selection committee. This committee was charged with the responsibility of conducting (1) an evaluation of the office of the president, (2) an evaluation of the board of regents/president relationship and (3) a self-evaluation of the board of regents. The regents' concern, as stated in the original announcement and final report, was to examine not just the performance of the president but the governance of the university as a whole.

The committee adopted a set of "performance objectives" by which the president's actions should be judged. These were drawn from the criteria used at the time of the president's selection and appointment. The president prepared a statement of stewardship for his first four years in office for the use of the board and the consultant. The committee employed an experienced consultant from outside the state to conduct interviews and to work with the committee in preparing the final report. The board of regents remained close to the operation, approving the performance objectives, deciding that the consultant should proceed by interviews rather than by questionnaires, and conducting its own self-study and assessment with the help of AGB materials.

Over a period of three months the consultant interviewed all the regents individually, the vice presidents, the four provosts as a group, the deans in groups of three or four, eight of the ten members of the faculty consultative committee, four of the six members of the student consultative committee, the president of the alumni association, five key members of the state legislature, and a sprinkling of officers of national educational organizations. The presidential assessment committee held one meeting with the regent professors, reporting the views of this senior faculty group to the consultant. No general invitation to comment was issued to the academic community. Some faculty members were critical because more faculty judgments were not included. Those who requested an opportunity to go on record were told that they could file their views with the consultant.

The consultant discussed his findings with the president and with the presidential assessment committee. He subsequently prepared a report which was discussed and approved for publication by the board of regents. This is in many ways a model doc-

ument, discussing first the strengths and shortcomings of the board as seen by its members, administrative officers and faculty, and second the strong and weak points in the administration of the university as seen both from within and without. It is an admirably comprehensive and candid document, but even so, some criticisms of individual officers were considered too delicate to print. The consultant was asked to report these to the regents individually or in groups of two. Both the board and the president found the report very helpful and expressed satisfaction with the evaluation.

The university is located in a sunshine-law state where all meetings are open to the press and the public. The presidential assessment committee met infrequently, much of its business being done by telephone among the members and with the consultant. The press was kept informed of the evaluation through committee reports to the board and subsequent discussion. The committee was able to carry out its delicate assignment quietly and without public fanfare, largely because the press exercised restraint in dealing with the issue. This was helped, in the view of one committee member, by the emphasis on governance as a whole rather than on the performance of the president. The whole process took approximately four months, and the cost, excluding the value of staff time, did not exceed $5,000.

9. ***Another midterm: a private college.*** After seven years as a president and with reappointment to a new five-year term having been made, the president suggested to the new chairman of the board that he would welcome a thorough review of his work and suggestions for improving his contribution to the college. The chairman appointed a committee of three trustees, with himself as one of the members, and the three together with the president decided on the procedures to be followed.

The committee decided to make inquiries of six different groups. The first was the trustees themselves to whom they sent a questionnaire inviting opinions on administration, faculty and curriculum, finance, and the character and personality of the president. The second consisted of eight faculty, chosen as "prestigious faculty types, engaged in faculty committees and at work with the governance or the curriculum or the admissions policies and thus in contact with the larger world than the classroom, seeing thus a bigger picture and having experience with the administration itself." Next was a group of seven administrative officers. The fourth was composed of six students—the student government head plus the chairmen of five student committees. Six past presidents of the alumni association made up the sixth group; and the last consisted of four college presidents within the state and two heads of state educational associations. Different sets of questions were designed for each of these groups.

In the case of faculty, administrative officers, and students the tailored questions were used as stimuli for discussion at personal interviews. The three trustees spent one full day on campus, each interviewing

seven of the 21 individuals composing these three groups, and thus among the three of them talking with all 21.

The committee then sorted out the written comments and the results of the interviews, drafting a report which was shared with the president at the next board meeting. In the words of the chairman they "went through the process describing where the information came from, what the general overall appraisals were and [the report] was rather candid about what it said vis-a-vis the president's strengths and weaknesses. This hopefully would suggest to the entire community that we had done the job and had reported what the report revealed." Although the report was not issued to the college community, the presence of four faculty and four students at the board meeting guaranteed that the word would get around.

The investigation did uncover a few hot issues which were discussed with the president and in an executive session of the board. These related less to the president's performance than to shortcomings of certain subordinate administrative officers, sufficiently serious to suggest that some personnel changes were in order.

In reflecting on the procedures followed the chairman wrote: "Not much that we concluded was a shock to anybody. The president, as we suspected, came off extremely well in terms of overall judgment about his competence and his performance. Beyond that, the exercise itself proved to be exciting, especially to the folks on campus who seemed to enjoy it and came extremely well prepared. They took it seriously and the psychology of this involvement, we thought, was a genuine plus in terms of campus morale. But along with the therapy there's a constructive element which will help us in terms of future strategy." No self-assessment was required of the president, and no official report was made to faculty, students and alumni. In retrospect the chairman is inclined to think that both would have been desirable.

4. A state system of higher education. The multicampus governing board adopted in 1977 an executive management policy on the terms of appointment, termination, retirement and evaluation of the chancellor, the vice chancellor and the presidents of the member institutions. It provided that these officers "shall be evaluated not later than the third year and again during each successive fifth year in office. No formal evaluation shall be undertaken during the three years immediately preceding retirement." The chancellor was instructed to develop guidelines for the evaluations in consultation with the vice chancellors and presidents and subject to the approval of the board.

In due course criteria were established touching on such areas as academic leadership and management, administrative leadership, internal relations with constituent groups, external relations, and the like. The criteria for the chancellor differed in some areas from those for the president, reflecting the differences in their administrative responsibilities. A physical examination is a part of every evaluation. The chancellor or

president submits a statement of stewardship indicating the kind of problems faced, the manner in which they were dealt with, and the prospects for the years immediately ahead. In the case of the presidents the chancellor takes the initiative in seeking opinions from faculty, students, administrative staff and "selected external groups" and on the basis of his findings makes a recommendation to the governing board.

This looks like a fairly standard process of formal evaluation. In fact its character is largely determined by the convictions of the chancellor who has been charged with developing suitable procedures. When it came time for an evaluation of the chancellor he suggested to the president (i.e., chairman) of the board that the executive committee make inquiries of the presidents of the institutions within the system, the vice chancellor, members of the inter-faculty and inter-student organizations, legislators and any others. He also submitted a self-assessment and the results of a physical examination. The inquiries were made, the responses compiled, and the board committed its enthusiastic backing of the chancellor who had served in the office for 17 years. Both the board president and the chancellor described the process as a relatively informal one, appropriate in view of the long and close relationship between the chancellor and the board.

Before the 1977 guidelines the process of presidential evaluation had been more structured, with elaborate questionnaires for sounding the opinions of various constituencies. The chancellor became increasingly dissatisfied with this type of procedure. "It produced judgments," he wrote, "which appear to reflect vested interests of the evaluators; it sought judgments from many persons who believe themselves too remote from the president to judge him; it took far too long; it was expensive in terms of the time of the committee members; and, possibly most serious, it failed to elicit responses from a sufficiently large sample to establish confidence that the results actually reflected the views of the faculty and students."

When, therefore, the time came for an evaluation of the president of the state university, the chancellor elected to follow quite informal lines. The president provided his self-assessment for the three years he had been in office, summarizing the major problems the university faced at the time of his arrival, the major steps he had taken to cope with these problems, and an estimate of where he had failed and what new problems lay ahead. He also provided the results of a medical examination. The chancellor engaged in personal discussions with faculty groups and individuals, campus administrators, students and a few off-campus individuals. A few faculty sent in letters, and a few more came to publicly scheduled open meetings. Telephone conversations were held with civic leaders, representatives of the press, legislators and prominent members of the community. Some of the individuals were suggested by the president; others were selected by the chancellor.

The chancellor then reported to the board, which considered and approved his recommendations. While the board had the final

decision, the evaluation itself was almost entirely in the hands of the chancellor. No questionnaires or other instruments were involved, and the president indicated that he thought some checklist of questions would be desirable. It should also be noted that the assessment was an examination of the performance of the president in office rather than an appraisal of the institution.

5. A large eastern church-related college. A full-fledged evaluation was requested by the president toward the end of his second four-year term. The board accordingly created an evaluation committee composed of five of its members and engaged the services of an experienced consultant.

Over a period of four months the consultant made five visits to the campus, two of which were of three days' duration, two of two days', and one for a single day. During these visits he talked with the president, 13 of the trustees, 18 administrators, 9 faculty members chosen for reasons of committee chairmanship or other administrative experience, several representatives of the student government, plus many faculty and students who voluntarily appeared at the hours set aside for unscheduled interviews.

In its final report the committee defined the purposes of the evaluation as strengthening the office of the president, clarifying the expectations and assumptions for the governing board, and enhancing the relationship between the chief executive officer and the board of trustees. The consultant kept these objectives in mind during the investigations and in his report to the board as a whole made recommendations (1) for certain structural changes in the governance of the college, (2) for procedural changes which would involve faculty more directly in certain policy decisions, (3) for improving the performance and effectiveness of the president, and (4) for improving the organization, membership and functioning of the board of trustees.

Following the evaluation, the president drew up a comprehensive list of long- and short-term objectives for his office. This together with the recommendations in the committee's report were approved by the board, and the president was reappointed with enthusiasm for a third term of four years. The chairman issued a public statement to the college community announcing the reappointment and appended to his statement the full committee's report and the president's list of objectives.

The evaluation was considered a valuable and constructive exercise by both president and trustees, well worth the $8,700 cost. Some of the trustees would have preferred a shorter period than the six months over which it extended. More frequent meetings with the consultant and the evaluation committee were seen, in retrospect, as desirable. At least one committee member felt that a team of consultants would have carried more weight than the single consultant. On the whole, however, the process was considered highly satisfactory, and in due course a repetition, perhaps on a more modest scale, is contemplated.

6. A multi-campus public system. By

mandate of the governing board the chancellor and the presidents of the institutions composing the system must undergo formal evaluations approximately every five years. Since the presidents are not on term appointments, the evaluation does not coincide with any need to reappoint or to terminate, and up to the present time no evaluation has led to a termination, although in one case resignation came shortly after the process of assessment. The purpose of the evaluation is "to assist the chancellor and the president to become more effective as chief executive officers. ...They will provide a mechanism for publicly demonstrating the university's concern about the quality of the constituent colleges, and its desire for accountability of its chief administrative officers. The evaluations will also allow the university a formal opportunity to clarify its own sense of mission and to communicate that mission more effectively to the colleges and to the community-at-large."

Normal procedure calls for notification by the chancellor well in advance that the time for a presidential assessment has come. The next step is the preparation by the president of a self-evaluation or statement of stewardship which includes a restatement of the performance goals and objectives agreed upon at the time of assuming office, a review of the extent to which these objectives have been realized and of the factors that forced a change in expectations or objectives, an outline of the major areas of institutional concern over the coming five years together with factors that may affect those concerns, and a summary of the president's own goals and objectives over the following two years.

The chancellor appoints in consultation with the president an evaluation team of three members: a president from outside the system and two distinguished educators, one of whom might be the chairman of the most recent visiting committee of the regional accrediting association. In practice the president usually suggests a half-dozen names, the chancellor a similar number, and the faculty council may add a few more. The chancellor and the president agree on a committee of three, one of whom is named chairman by the chancellor.

The evaluation team is provided with a substantial number of documents including the most recent report of the accrediting agency, the president's statement of stewardship, budgetary data, mission statements, and the like. The charge to the committee is to review the president's performance with respect to academic leadership, administrative leadership, relations with the college community, and role outside the college.

"It is particularly important," state the official guidelines, "that the select evaluation team get a broadly representative view of the president's performance including input from the various constituencies within the institution. To this end the team will be expected to make use of existing resources within the institution such as standing or *ad hoc* committees for evaluation of administrators, leaders of faculty and student government bodies, university faculty senate delegations, faculty chairpersons of college committees and departments, other top ad-

ministrators." In a three-day marathon session the committee meets first with the president and a representative of the chancellor's office to review plans, then interviews or holds hearings on campus with faculty, students and administrators, and finally, after an exit interview with the president, meets as a committee to hammer out conclusions and parcel out to the members the sections of the report which each will write. It is a grueling task, for the committee normally talks individually or in groups with 300 to 400 people, and in one case they saw 1500.

The chairman must submit the committee's report within three weeks of the completion of the interviews. The president is allowed two weeks to study the report and discuss it with the chancellor. The latter then has another two weeks in which to decide on his or her own report and recommendations based on the report of the committee and on personal experience with the president.

Of the six presidential evaluations to date three left the presidents very happy, two not at all happy, and one quite angry because of what he considered unfair criticisms from his administrative staff. One of the happy presidents strongly recommends formal evaluations as strengthening the president's position and diffusing the recurrent faculty attacks in a highly politicized system. One of the unhappy presidents found the experience undignified and demeaning, calculated by its very nature to erode presidential status and authority. A member of the university's executive staff intimately involved with presidential evaluation is not sure that they have turned out to be a good thing. They put the president on the spot, and in a highly political university he or she becomes terribly vulnerable. In a public system some form of accountability may be unavoidable, but the evidence from this system is that the price can be high.

9. A community college. The president requested that an evaluation of his performance be made before the end of his first year in office. According to the Chairman, "all segments of the college community participated in this evaluation." An unusual feature of the procedure was the central role played by the president. A committee composed of faculty, students and staff (custodial, clerical, support and administrative) fashioned a 24-question survey which the president then distributed to all members of the faculty and staff. These forms were to be returned unsigned to the president's office. Shortly thereafter the president sent a memo to the college community thanking them for their cooperation, enclosing a summary of the results, and setting up an open session for discussion of the evaluation for anyone interested. Subsequently it was decided by the evaluation committee that assessment of the president should be made every other year.

While the president was largely managing his own evaluation, the board was engaged in a self-study program, using materials which had been prepared by the Association of Governing Boards for the specific purpose of enabling boards to assess their own

performance. These self-study materials, available in a packet from AGB, include carefully selected and tested questions on trustee responsibilities together with a rating scale. They have proved here and elsewhere to be useful in improving board performance.

8. A state university system. In 1977 the board of regents laid down procedures for the performance evaluation of all presidents and of the chief executive officer of the system. They prescribed that presidential reviews shall be undertaken every four years and shall consist of (1) a self-assessment by the president, (2) the appointment of an *ad hoc* evaluation committee by the chief executive officer and a special committee of regents appointed by the chairman, (3) a written appraisal by the *ad hoc* committee of the president's performance, (4) discussion of the written appraisal by the CEO and the president and response by the president if so desired, and (5) recommendation by the CEO to the board of regents and appropriate action by the board. The whole process takes approximately three months.

The central step in this process is the work of the *ad hoc* evaluation committee which consists of the elected chairman of the faculty senate, the president of the student body, a member of the administrative staff selected by the president, and a representative from the chief executive officer's office as convenor. Since the member institutions differ in character and size, considerable flexibility in determining the judgments of the various constituencies is permitted. The committee members, representative of different constituencies, may present a single report or separate evaluations. The CEO may supplement the committee's assessment by requesting written appraisals from members of his administrative staff and from consultations with individuals or groups both on and off campus.

Two presidents and the systemwide chief executive officer have been evaluated to date. The review of the third president has been postponed as a result of dissatisfaction with the procedures, which will be reviewed when a new system head takes office. In all three instances there was a general impression that they were conducted summarily as a means of determining whether to continue the appointments.

In the case of President A the usual procedure was followed. All department chairmen were interviewed and as many faculty as wished to meet with the committee. The results of the inquiries indicated that the president was more highly regarded on campus than some had anticipated. The president resigned a year after the evaluation, however, and subsequently expressed the conviction that periodic formal assessments are of doubtful value in comparison with continuous monitoring by a concerned board.

President B's faculty had become highly critical of his administrative style and behavior. He agreed to the use of a questionnaire that consisted of 28 statements about the president's behavior to which the respondents could indicate "agree," "disagree"

or "no opinion." Later, in reviewing the evaluation procedures and making recommendations for their improvement, he wrote: "In my naivete I agreed to a seemingly harmless questionnaire which apparently was much more conducive to negative than positive comments." At least one member of the committee thought the procedure to be satisfactory, though he did indicate that faculty had been asked to make judgments in areas where they were relatively unfamiliar and that student responses were least valid since most of them did not know the president and were not cognizant of his responsibilities. The president felt that "the procedures were hardly carried out in a dignified manner fitting the office of the president." He went on to suggest that this was almost inevitable where so much emphasis is placed on faculty attitudes and in a situation where the developing struggle for authority on campus as a result of union agitation is bound to make president and faculty adversaries.

The state system head reviewed the report with the president before making his recommendations to the board of regents which included the suggestion that another evaluation be conducted a year later. This was done by three regents who visited the campus for a day and talked with various members of the faculty.

The review of the chief executive officer of the system came at a time when mounting pressures, political and institutional, were threatening his office. As the first CEO under new constitutional provisions he had the unenviable task of establishing the authority of the central administration and its freedom from political intervention. It was a formula guaranteed to invite the hostility of individual institutions accustomed to operating largely on their own and of legislative and executive officers accustomed to exercising considerable control over the educational establishment.

The CEO prepared an elaborate self-assessment reviewing these problems and his efforts to cope with them. An *ad hoc* evaluation committee was appointed consisting of the president of one of the member institutions as chairman, the chairman of the inter-faculty council, the president of the associated students of the state university and a member of the central administration selected by the CEO. This committee prepared an elaborate questionnaire consisting of 25 questions dealing with such issues as cooperation among campuses, the fiscal integrity of the system, faculty participation in system decisions, to which the respondents were asked to indicate whether there had been an increase, no change or decrease during the tenure of the system head. These questions were followed by another 36 dealing with the nature of the CEO's decisions and his style of operation. Respondents were asked to rate the CEO and also to indicate whether they felt "very certain" or only "fairly certain" of their positions. This complex instrument was mailed out to 585 individuals — 331 faculty, 99 students, 75 legislators, 71 administrative staff and 9 presidents. Three hundred forty-four replies were received, two-thirds coming from faculty and students. Many comments were

also received. The committee tabulated the results which were presented to the board and shared with the CEO. The committee's report consisted of a summary and analysis of some of the more obvious questionnaire results, which were both positive and negative. The CEO presented to the board a careful analysis of the answers, showing that the views of those who were best informed about his work were quite favorable and that the generally negative judgments resulted from the overweighing of the responses from faculty and students who had less chance to becoming familiar with his problems.

The chief executive officer received a new two-year contract at the end of the evaluation, but resigned a year later. The guidelines for future evaluations are under review and may well avoid some of the difficulties and mistakes in the procedures outlined above. One obvious omission is any attempt to assess the governance of the system. As the CEO correctly pointed out in his response to the evaluation committee's report, the board must develop realistic expectations of what is desirable and feasible for him to do; and the public, including the various campuses, must distinguish between the acts of the CEO for which he must take full responsibility and those acts that are mandated by the decisions of the governing board.

Appendix B

Guidelines Used for Presidential Evaluations

Guidelines Used for Presidential Evaluation by a Large Private University

The president of a university, who is hired for a three-year term, should be evaluated preliminarily at the end of his second year of service in accordance with the following procedure:

1. President prepares statement of self-assessment, including his objectives upon assuming office and the progress toward achieving them.

2. With the approval of the board of trustees or the executive committee the chairman of the board appoints a special presidential evaluation committee.

3. An external consultant is chosen by the board or the executive committee after discussion with the president.

4. The presidential evaluation committee, the consultant and the president work out a plan of evaluation, according to which the incumbent will be appraised.

5. In accordance with this plan of evaluation, the presidential evaluation committee and the consultant review the quality of presidential leadership with the university constituencies: administrative officers, faculty, students, and leaders of the community.

6. The consultant prepares his preliminary report for the presidential evaluation committee.

7. Presidential evaluation committee prepares its own preliminary report, and submits it to the president for his response.

d. After consideration of the president's response the presidential evaluation committee submits a report to the board.

Procedure for Presidential Evaluation Developed at a Small Church-Related College

A key responsibility of the board of trustees is to select, evaluate and determine the tenure of the president as the chief executive officer of the college. The parallel responsibility is to give the president the full support and encouragement of the board of trustees for so long as he or she is continued in office. These responsibilities can be performed effectively only if there is some regular process for the evaluation of presidential performance of duties.

There are many different approaches to the task of presidential evaluation which will serve the needs of the board and the president. They vary in both frequency and formality. Whatever approach is adopted, however, it is important to have agreement between the board and the president at the beginning of their relationship. To this end, the following process is recommended by the president:

A. Purposes

1. To provide the board of trustees with the necessary data for effective evaluation of the president as the board fulfills its chief responsibility for selecting, evaluating and determining the tenure of the president.

2. To provide the president with information helpful to his or her continuous self-improvement on the job.

There is a constant interaction between these two purposes in the evaluation process. It is appropriate and helpful, however, to emphasize one or the other of these two purposes at various times in a regular cycle and it is important at all times to be clear as to the use of data gathered in the evaluation.

B. Process

This suggested process begins with the assumption that there should be an annual process of presidential evaluation which has as its primary purpose the self-improvement of the president; whereas there should be a more public and formal evaluation process on a regular and systematic basis once every five years for the purpose of determining whether or not the president should be continued in office. Implicit in this approach is the belief that the president should be appointed for a five-year term of office which can be renewed each five years indefinitely on the basis of the agreed-upon process for presidential appointment, evaluation and review. The president serves at the pleasure of the board and termination of contract at other times can occur in accordance with an agreed-upon process.

1. A three-person subcommittee on management review of the executive committee will be appointed from that body by the chairman of the board of trustees to give leadership to the evaluation process. The chairman of the board shall serve as chairperson of this committee.

2. Annual Performance Review:

(a) The subcommittee will review with

the president at the beginning of the year (1) the position description for the president contained in the bylaws; (2) the long range planning documents of the college; (3) the annual management objectives developed by the president and submitted by him or her to the executive committee, and (4) the performance standards for this session with the subcommittee.

As a result of this review, the president and the committee will agree upon the priorities for the year which will serve as the common frame of reference for the annual performance review of the president.

(b) At the conclusion of the fiscal year the president will prepare a self-evaluation to be discussed with the committee.

(c) Prior to the meeting with the president, the committee on management review will notify the members of the board of trustees that the routine annual evaluation process is underway. They will be given an opportunity to submit comments if they wish, but the approach will be "low key."

(d) The committee on management review will meet the president to discuss his stewardship of his responsibilities. In this meeting discussion will focus on the president's self-evaluation and relevant data concerning job performance in light of the position description, long-range plans and the annual management objectives. Annual management objectives and personal growth goals may be outcomes of this meeting along with formal recommendations to the executive committee.

(e) The committee on management review will report its findings and recommendations to the executive committee which will also make a report to the full board of trustees.

(f) In the context of this evaluation process, the president will be encouraged, but not required, to develop and to discuss with the committee a personal growth contract which covers the following points: (1) trends in higher education of importance to his continued job performance; (2) the criteria for evaluation which he believes are most helpful and relevant to effective assessment of his job performance; (3) personal growth goals which are important to his continuing effectiveness; (4) those professional development activities most helpful in order to meet the personal growth goals, and (5) the commitment of time and resources by the board necessary for the fulfillment of the personal growth goals of the president.

This personal growth contract may become part of the employment contract if this is mutually desired by the president and the committee on management review.

(g) The president will also be encouraged but not required to implement a process by which members of the faculty and staff and student leadership can provide input concerning presidential performance. Since its primary purpose is the improvement of presidential performance, data would be available only to the president except as he or she may elect to share it with the committee on management review or with others.

3. Evaluation for reappointment every five years:

(a) The chairman of the board will be

charged with engaging the services of an external consultant to assist with the process of presidential evaluation. In fulfilling this obligation the chairman shall act upon the joint recommendation of the president and the management review committee.

(b) At the fall meeting of the board of trustees during the fifth year of a presidential term the agenda will provide an opportunity for the board to explore its objectives in the process of presidential evaluation, the context of the review, the relationship to earlier search or evaluation procedures and criteria, and the role of the consultant. If possible, the consultant will meet the board at this time.

(c) By February 1st of his or her fifth year of a presidential term, the president would be asked to prepare a self-assessment statement along the following lines: (1) expectations and objectives upon assuming the position, including comments on the search process; (2) assessment of success within the context of those objectives; (3) modifications of initial assumptions based upon present knowledge; (4) the principal issues presently confronting the office; (5) revision of initial objectives to confront current issues; (6) concepts of leadership criteria based upon past years in office; and proposals concerning the most valid criteria for use in the present instance, and (7) thoughts about who ought to look at the self-assessment statement with him ("significant others"), and what type of responses would be the most useful to the president and to the institution.

(d) During the first two weeks of February: (1) The consultant will meet with the management review committee to identify key individuals and issues. (They will have available to them concise program and budgeting documentation from each area from the management of the college, the annual management objectives, the long-range planning documents of the university and the president's self-assessment essay. Their basic assignment at this time is to translate their sense of what the university is about and how it works into basic categories of presidential responsibilities. These categories in turn become assessment criteria to be used as a framework for constituency discussions). (2) Consultant meets with the president to review self-assessment, identify problem areas, and discuss evaluation strategy. (3) Consultant meets with those present and former board and search committee members who participated in the presidential selection, in order to reconstruct the ultimate criteria and priority agenda that conditioned their choice.

(e) During the last two weeks of February, there will be a series of preliminary meetings based upon issue/criteria material,* including: (1) consultant and subcommittee talk with a variety of constituency groups, which have been self-selected in a reasonable number and mix; (2) confidential sessions between consultant and principal members of the president's staff, and (3) conversations between consultant, members of subcommittee, and external constituents suggested by the president and the board.

* There will be no formal questionnaires or public surveys.

(f) During March (for completion by the end of the third week) a preliminary document *emphasizing* issues and inquiries and *substantiating* evaluative conclusions will be prepared by the consultant and reviewed by the subcommittee. (1) The preliminary document is to be analyzed during a series of exchanges between the subcommittee, the consultant, and constituency groups. (2) The consultant will present the preliminary document to the president for his response.

(g) Following this stage the consultant will provide a draft of the final report to the committee on management review for their refinement, and transmission with comments to the board. This task is to be completed no later than ten days prior to the spring meeting of the board. The final report will stress search and evaluation procedures and criteria, constituency observations, leadership strengths and areas for improvement, and guidelines for trustee action. Fundamental recommendations and specific decisions will rest solely with the board itself. Board meets with the president (and consultant if desired) to discuss report. They formulate an action agenda for their mutual concentration upon priority leadership needs, and upon a determination of how well they are being met.

(h) On the basis of this report, at the spring meeting the board will vote either to reappoint the president to another five-year term or to terminate the appointment of the president and initiate the search for a successor.

Manual of Procedures Adopted by the Board of Trustees of Stockton State College

1. The chairman of the board of trustees will appoint a select committee consisting of three trustees which committee will be charged with the responsibility of conducting an evaluation of the performance of the president.

2. The board of trustees will select the appropriate time in the college calendar for the evaluation process and will announce a schedule for all steps in the evaluation process. This schedule will normally not exceed eight weeks, encompassing three meetings of the board of trustees, and excluding a time when the reappointment of the college president is under consideration or is about to be considered.

3. The board of trustees will request the college president to submit the required five-year evaluation statement and will discuss that statement with the president.

4. The select committee will receive the college president's five-year evaluation statement and make it available to those who may have reason to comment and/or have interest in commenting on the performance of the president.

5. The select committee will advise all interested parties, including those external to the college, that the committee will receive written statements from individuals which statements shall directly concern the performance of the president. The written responses shall be presentations of sub-

stantive matter, with appropriate illustrations, rather than official statements or position papers from organizations and groups, or expressions of opinions. The latter can be regularly communicated to the board of trustees throughout the year.

6. The select committee will offer the college president an opportunity to review and respond, in writing, to the information it has received in the written statements and interviews (*see paragraph 7*). The committee, however, shall hold the authorship of all statements in confidence.

7. The select committee may arrange to communicate with those who have submitted written statements to discuss the contents of their statements. Such communications are at the discretion of the select committee and the arrangements shall be specified by the committee.

8. The select committee will prepare a preliminary report on the evaluation of the president's performance for presentation to the board of trustees.

9. The select committee will confer with the college president and review/discuss the preliminary report and the information upon which the report is based.

10. The subcommittee will then prepare a final summary report evaluating the president's performance and present the report to the board of trustees for consideration.

11. The board of trustees will confer with the college president to discuss the report as a basis for improvement of performance and/or other actions considered appropriate by the board.

12. The select committee will present a condensed version of the evaluation report and after approval of that summary version by the board of trustees will make the summary report available to interested parties.

13. The select committee will assess the criteria which were given high priority at the time of presidential selection/appointment or the previous five-year review, whichever is applicable. If this assessment indicates that previous goals and objectives for performance are no longer applicable, the board of trustees will establish new goals and objectives as the basis for future evaluations of the performance of the college president.

14. The select committee will thoroughly review the evaluation process upon completion and recommend modifications to the board of trustees as appropriate.

Guidelines for the Review Process for The Presidents at State University of New York

The Trustees of State University of New York have acted to strengthen the role of president by the designation of evaluation periods coupled with continuing status in academic rank and provision for study leaves. These offer each president a more flexible approach to his or her duties, while emphasizing accountability in the leadership role.

Responsibility for the evaluation of the president's performance is clearly vested in the trustees (Article IX, *Policies of the Board of Trustees*) and must be carried out by the

chancellor, as the board's chief administrative officer. The trustees intend that the guidelines for a presidential review process will provide the chancellor and trustees with an effective mechanism for a comprehensive and fair evaluation; that they will involve constituent groups, as necessary; and, most importantly, that they will be of assistance to the president in defining and strengthening his or her leadership role. While proposing that these guidelines normally will be applied, the trustees explicitly reserve the right to modify them in particular instances.

A. Principles

The presidential review process is distinct from the initial search process for a president. In the latter, the various constituents of the campus join the search for, and the college council recommends to the trustees, the best possible candidate or candidates for the position. The search is extensive, and the screening process may be both lengthy and complex. The chancellor, through his representative, offers guidance and assistance. The major work of a screening process remains a campus undertaking and is coordinated by the college council.

The presidential review process differs from the preceding in that the broad search element is not a factor, for the president being evaluated is known to all concerned. He or she has already served under the direction of the board of trustees and the chancellor as the chief administrative officer of the campus. The review is a trustee function and process initiated by the chancellor in behalf of the trustees. Since the president also has interacted during the period of service with various constituent groups on campus, it is both appropriate and desirable that, in conducting the review, the chancellor and trustees consult with the college and council and, that appropriate consultation also be assured with representative spokesman of the faculty, the administrative staff, and the students. Care should be taken to provide input to the process by alumni, nonteaching professionals, classified employees, and local community groups.

In Article IX of the *Policies of the Board of Trustees, 1976*, the trustees have defined the responsibilities of the chief administrative officer of the campus. These provide the criteria against which the president's effectiveness will be reviewed.

The principle of confidentiality will be observed throughout the review process. This will apply to discussions among all those who participate, and to written documents other than the "Presidential Statement: Condition of the Campus." The team report will be shared by the campus following its review by the trustees.

With these principles to guide the review, the following process is established.

B. Procedural Steps

1. The chancellor shall contact a selected number of presidents to establish a readiness for a professional performance review. The contact shall be made within a five-year period of the initial appointment and/or a five-year period from the last performance review.

The reviews shall be conducted periodically. The dates shall be determined by the chancellor and the president in conference. The design of the periodic reviews shall be flexible and personal.

2. The chancellor, with the president, shall establish a schedule for the performance review activities. In no case shall the review process exceed four months. The on-site schedule shall be developed for a period when the college is in operation. However, preparatory activities may be completed during the summer months.

(a) The chancellor shall request the president to prepare and submit a "Presidential Statement: Condition of the Campus," with particular reference to administration in recent past, the present and immediate future. The statement shall be no longer than twenty pages. The president may decide to append necessary and appropriate materials. Such documents as the president's annual report and the current Middle State Association self-study report may be used as appropriate in the review. The contents addressed in the statement must relate to trustee's criteria for presidential responsibility.

(b) The president shall submit the statement to the chancellor, and, at the same time, to the chairperson of the college council. The statement shall be considered a public document.

(c) The chairperson of the college council shall make copies available to the members of the council. The chairperson of the college council shall request the president to discuss the statement with the council.

(d) After having received the statement from the president, and a response to it from the chairperson of the council, the chancellor shall consult with the president on the formation of a visiting team from a panel of selected college and university presidents, or comparable experienced peers, from outside of SUNY. The team shall number three, with the addition of a person who will serve as a representative of the chancellor, ex-officio.

(e) The chancellor shall appoint one member from the visiting team to serve as a chairperson. The team will be given the "Presidential Statement: Condition of the Campus," the council chairperson's response, and such other documents deemed to be necessary by the chancellor.

(f) The chairperson of the visiting team shall make a site visit to the campus to determine a schedule, including interviews and such meetings with campus personnel which will assure a careful assessment of leadership and condition of the campus.

(g) The team site visit of up to three days shall be used to talk with and receive the views of the president, chairperson of the college council, and the elected presiding officers of the campus faculty and campus student bodies, as well as such other persons and constituents deemed necessary by the team chairperson to obtain an accurate impression of the leadership and campus condition. Campus leaders may receive input from their constituencies in oral or written form. Evaluative information thus obtained, if included, must be attributable. This would preclude the use of an opinion polling

or survey procedure for constituent input. The team chairperson shall be responsible for drafting a team report to the chancellor. The general approach and format for the review will be similar to, but not identical with, a Middle States team visit and report. There shall be an oral report by the visiting team to the president prior to leaving the campus.

(h) The president, upon receipt of the written team report, in draft form, shall share a copy with the council chairperson. The draft team report shall be reviewed by the president and by the chairperson. Questions of fact and such other matters as deemed appropriate by the president and/or chairperson shall be communicated to the team chairperson and to the president and council chairperson. The chairperson of the visiting team shall then prepare and forward to the chairperson of the council a final team report on the presidential review and condition of the campus, with copies to the president.

(i) The council shall transmit the final team report to the chancellor, along with any appropriate commentary.

(j) The chancellor shall discuss the final report with the president in conference. A report shall be made by the chancellor, assisted by the president, to the trustees.

3. The chancellor shall share the report with the campus after the report has been presented and discussed with the trustees.

Public Announcement by the Montclair State Board of Trustees Following Presidential Evaluation

The board of trustees has completed its evaluation of Dr. David W.D. Dickson and is pleased to reaffirm its confidence in him. Presidential effectiveness is bound inextricably with institutional health, and the recent Middle States accreditation report confirms that the acacdemic quality and prestige of Montclair State College continues to be strong under Dr. Dickson's leadership.

The board is grateful to those of many constituencies who supplied valuable information. During the course of evaluation the board and the president have developed certain goals and expectations for the future performance of the president.

The board finds Dr. Dickson a man of ideas, respected as a scholar and a humanist. The trustees commend him for his successful efforts which have maintained the college's position for the past four years. It plans to continue this dialogue by conducting another evaluation in consultation with the vice presidents and deans, the students, faculty, staff, community, board of higher education and department of higher education. This evaluation will be completed by June 1981. Members of the board look for strong, aggressive leadership and planning from Dr. Dickson and the continued strength of the institution in the years ahead.

Appendix C

Letters, Questionnaires and Rating Scales

Letter from Committee Member of a Private College Inviting Faculty Participation

Dear Faculty Member:

As you know, the board, at the president's request, has appointed a presidential review committee to undertake a thorough study of his past performance and future promise as president. The review committee is soliciting the views of all segments of the college's constituency, and as the committee member assigned to approach the faculty, I write you now to invite your written comments. Later, over the period December 1-3, we expect to be on campus, meeting with appropriate faculty committees, and talking with individual faculty members who desire to speak with us.

Everyone has his own view of the role of president, and the review committee does not wish to place arbitrary restrictions on the range of evaluative comment by establishing a too-rigid definition of guidelines. You are therefore free to speak to any aspect of the

president's performance that concerns you, but we would be particularly interested in having your view in such matters as the following:

Adequacy of decision-making: degree of input and participation of others in decisions affecting the college community, the president's sensitivity to diverse viewpoints, the objectivity and fairness of decisions reached, etc.

Adequacy of leadership: his ability to identify problems before they escalate into crises, his handling of crises which do arise, his ability to articulate a vision of excellence for the college and to inspire commitment to that vision on the part of all concerned, etc.

Adequacy of administration: his relations with various segments of the college community, his leadership in fund raising, his handling of the business operations of the college, the maintenance of the college's tradition and character, etc.

In thinking about the future, it seems clear that the next few years will witness major challenges to the college in its effort to maintain and improve quality in the face of serious financial constraints. Based on his past performance, how well do you think the president can provide the kind of leadership the college will need in the years ahead? Among the issues the president will surely face are the following:

— *expansion, and with it the possibility of coeducation;*
— *continued cooperation with [neighboring institution];*
— *the maintenance of faculty quality and morale.*

May I ask that the committee have your written comments in hand by December 1? This is necessary because I'd need all the written input a few days in advance of my final visit in the first week of December.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely yours,

Letter from Committee Member of a Private College Inviting Staff Participation

Dear Member of the [Maintenance and Operations] Staff:

You may already know that President _____ has requested the board to make a thorough study of his past performance and future promise as _____'s president. A special review committee has been appointed, and is in the process of obtaining the views of all segments of the college community on this important matter. I write now to invite any comments you might wish to make for the committee's benefit.

You are free to write about any aspect of President _____'s performance that you wish, and you are also free to ignore this request entirely, but the review committee wants to give every member of the _____ community an opportunity to contribute to the review if they care to do so. We would be particularly interested in having comments on the president's ability to deal fairly with the various groups on campus, his handling of crisis situations, his willingness to listen to other people's ideas and complaints. In what way has he been a good leader? In what ways a poor one?

I can promise you that anything you write will be treated in confidence. Nothing will go beyond the committee, and once its work is completed in January all written material will be destroyed. I hope this assurance will make you feel easy about saying anything that is on your mind.

May I have your replies by December 6? They should be addressed to me at . . .

Sincerely yours,

Generalized Evaluation Instrument Used at a Midwestern Church-Related College

(Please send the completed form to the office of the dean of the faculty by March 23.)

Please comment on any or all of the following dimensions of President _____'s performance. Use the reverse side of the sheets if you need additional space. [*Original left adequate space after questions for respondent's comments.*]

1. Evaluate President _____'s effectiveness as a leader in working with the faculty (and through the administrative staff and committees) in "defining and developing Reformed principles in education," in "shaping educational policy," in "integrating faith and learning," and in "promoting the student body's educational and spiritual welfare."

2. Evaluate his administrative decision-making style in terms of such categories as adequately getting and taking faculty advice, appropriate degree of consultation and communication, proper identification and use of faculty expertise and skill.

3. Evaluate whether his decisions are adequately communicated to the faculty.

4. Evaluate the adequacy of his performance in promoting faculty development in scholarship and teaching.

5. Evaluate his relationship to the faculty in terms of such categories as fairness, sensitivity to faculty needs and welfare, handling of problems, accessibility.

6. Evaluate his performance as chairman of faculty meetings.

Please comment on what you perceive to be President _____'s main strengths and weaknesses. (This may include a brief review of reference to items already mentioned.)

If your duties include some special, formal relationship to the president (department or division chairman, special assignments, membership of committees on which he sits or which he chairs, etc.), please identify the strengths and weaknesses which you perceive as characterizing his performance within that relationship. Please specify the nature of that special relationship, unless doing so would jeopardize a desire to remain anonymous.

Please add any additional comments you may wish to make on the reverse side of this sheet.

_____

Signature (optional)

Detailed Questionnaire Used By Western Private College

Please check the appropriate category for your own position.

- ☐ Administrator
- ☐ Administrator Reporting Directly to the President
- ☐ Faculty
- ☐ Maintenance/Clerical
- ☐ Student
- ☐ Trustee

Please rate President _____ on the following criteria by circling the appropriate number following each answer.

5 — Superior
4 — Above Average
3 — Average
2 — Below Average
1 — Poor
0 — Not Applicable or Not Observed

A. Areas of Presidential Functioning

I. Academic Administration and Planning

1. Has provided leadership in developing and understanding institutional goals and objectives 5 4 3 2 1 0
2. Has contributed to developing and enhancing the quality of the institution 5 4 3 2 1 0
3. Has promoted curricular change in response to student and societal interests and needs 5 4 3 2 1 0
4. Has an awareness of educational ideas, trends, and innovations 5 4 3 2 1 0
5. Supports the principles of academic freedom 5 4 3 2 1 0
6. Supports others in their efforts to accomplish departmental/area/institutional changes 5 4 3 2 1 0
7. Takes initiative in program and staff development 5 4 3 2 1 0
8. Encourages and promotes long-range planning consistent with institutional need 5 4 3 2 1 0

II. Budgetary and Fiscal Management

9. Provides sound fiscal management, including the ability to address budgetary matters in a way that achieves more efficient and effective use of resources 5 4 3 2 1 0

10. Has the ability to comprehend and evaluate fiscal and budgetary matters 5 4 3 2 1 0
11. Has a favorable record of attracting funds to the institution 5 4 3 2 1 0
12. Possesses a good understanding of the institution's financial needs 5 4 3 2 1 0
13. Has promoted greater college-wide understanding of finance as it affects the institution 5 4 3 2 1 0

III. Communication

14. Communicates well his and/or the institution's position with faculty/staff/students 5 4 3 2 1 0
15. Demonstrates accuracy and clarity in written and verbal modes 5 4 3 2 1 0
16. Has the ability to convince others of an idea, knowing how to be aggressive without being offensive or antagonistic 5 4 3 2 1 0
17. Promotes esprit de corp and group identity within the campus community 5 4 3 2 1 0
18. Is accessible; promotes a feeling of openness in seeking the thinking of others 5 4 3 2 1 0
19. Is willing to discuss the rationale of administrative actions and decisions 5 4 3 2 1 0
20. Is credible and honest in face-to-face relationships with others 5 4 3 2 1 0
21. Has the ability to relate with students as individuals and in groups 5 4 3 2 1 0

IV. Decision Making and Problem Solving

22. Possesses a clear vision of the goals and future of the college 5 4 3 2 1 0
23. Is committed to the goals and welfare of the total college 5 4 3 2 1 0
24. Delegates appropriate responsibility to subordinates and supports them in carrying out their responsibilities 5 4 3 2 1 0
25. Establishes standards of control, review, and follow-up to insure efficient and effective task completion by himself and others 5 4 3 2 1 0
26. Has the ability to make sound, logical decisions, even under stress; is objective 5 4 3 2 1 0
27. Encourages participative decision making, seeking input from those most directly affected 5 4 3 2 1 0

28. Has competence to provide conflict resolution	5 4 3 2 1 0
29. Shows sensitivity for those affected by decisions	5 4 3 2 1 0
30. Has the ability to identify and analyze problems and issues confronting the institution	5 4 3 2 1 0
31. Has the ability to reevaluate and if necessary retract decisions	5 4 3 2 1 0
32. Is well-organized and efficient in the accomplishment of his duties	5 4 3 2 1 0
33. Provides for the involvement of students in the decision making which affects them	5 4 3 2 1 0

V. External Relations

34. Has the ability to relate to and communicate with the larger community external to the college	5 4 3 2 1 0
35. Represents the institution in a positive manner to its various publics	5 4 3 2 1 0
36. Conveys a positive and progressive image of the college	5 4 3 2 1 0
37. Exemplifies the Christian concept of the college in both his personal and professional life	5 4 3 2 1 0

VI. Personnel

38. Seeks out those best qualified to fill administrative faculty vacancies	5 4 3 2 1 0
39. Maintains the confidence and trust of those with whom he relates	5 4 3 2 1 0
40. Exercises good judgment in dealing with sensitive issues regarding faculty/administrative/student relationships	5 4 3 2 1 0
41. Gives due recognition to faculty/staff accomplishments	5 4 3 2 1 0
42. Is effective in forming, developing, and supervising an administrative network to implement policy	5 4 3 2 1 0
43. Shows evidence of the ability to select strong subordinates	5 4 3 2 1 0
44. Seeks and uses the counsel of immediate subordinates	5 4 3 2 1 0
45. Provides an on-going procedure for evaluation of other members of the college management team	5 4 3 2 1 0
46. Displays an ability to motivate subordinates in positive ways	5 4 3 2 1 0

B. Administrative Effectiveness

Please answer the final two questions as definitively as possible. Use additional paper if necessary.

1. What makes the president an effective administrator?

2. How do you feel the president could increase his effectiveness?

Signature (optional)

When completed, please return sealed in the attached envelope on or before February 3, 1978.

Rating Scale Used by Committee at a State University System

These criteria provide a framework for making evaluations. Each question should be considered in light of the incumbent being evaluated and his or her strength in that particular category.

Ratings should be made on a ten-point scale with the value of 10 given when it is deemed that the incumbent is outstanding and should rate the highest mark. The number 5 represents a satisfactory rating and lower numbers lesser degrees of satisfaction.

This institution should not be used to determine some final score and then be compared with evaluations for other incumbents. Rather, it is a way in which specific topics can be touched upon, and an overall view of a person's competency can be derived in as objective a means as possible.

Results of these ratings should be kept confidential.

Academic Affairs

Is there evidence of an understanding of:

1. Role of higher education in society? _____
2. The academic goals of the university and/or the regency system? _____
3. The process of academic planning? _____
4. The existing programs? _____
5. The role of the faculty in governance? _____

Administrative Affairs

Personnel

1. Has an outstanding administrative and civil service staff been recruited? _____
2. Have affirmative action goals been reached? _____
3. Is the morale of the staff high? _____
4. Are there satisfactory procedures for evaluating administrative and civil service staff? _____
5. Are salaries paid to administrative and civil service staff defensible when compared with other staffs elsewhere? _____
6. Is the incumbent held in high esteem by subordinates? _____

Fiscal and Business

1. Is there evidence of a thorough understanding of the budgets? _____
2. The budget process? _____
3. Are projects or contracts requiring board approval developed and presented in a timely fashion? _____
4. Are reports to the board complete, accurate and of high quality? _____
5. Is there evidence of long-range fiscal and physical plant planning? _____
6. Is fiscal and budgetary reporting timely and accurate? _____

Faculty

Is there sensitivity to:

1. Faculty participation in governance? _____
2. Academic freedom and tenure policies? _____
3. The need for appropriate grievance procedures? _____
4. The need to support affirmative action programs? _____

Students

Is there sensitivity to:

1. The needs of students with respect to their varying purposes for attending a university? _____
2. Student participation in governance? _____
3. Student participation in faculty evaluation? _____
4. Student participation in determining appropriate activities on campus? _____

External Relations

Is there evidence that incumbent has strong support from:

1. The community? _____
2. Municipal leaders? _____
3. Legislative representatives from the area? _____
4. Staffs of BHE, BOR, legislature? _____
5. Community college leaders? _____

Personal Traits

How is incumbent rated as to:

1. Poise under pressure? _____
2. Integrity? _____
3. Energy? _____
4. Skill in relating to others? _____
5. Sensitivity to: _____
   a. faculty and staff needs? _____
   b. affirmative action? _____
   c. appropriate relationships with board of regents? _____

Trends and Performance

1. Is the incumbent becoming a stronger and more able administrator as time goes by? _____
2. Has the incumbent attained the goals he has set for himself and his office? _____

Rating Scale Developed by Herbert E. Phillips, President of Lake City Community College and Widely Used by Community Colleges in Florida.

Rate the following statements on a 5-point scale. The rating of 5 means the statement is absolutely true. The rating of 1 means it is not true at all. The rating of 0 means "no knowledge."

1. When he knows wishes of the board, he carries them out. _____
2. Enough information is given the board that intelligent decisions can be made _____
3. Information is given the board soon enough to be read and assimilated. _____
4. Ably represents the college and board at local, state and national levels. _____
5. Is respected at the local, state and national levels. _____
6. Stays abreast of educational developments and trends. _____
7. Is honest and forthright in his dealings with the board. _____
8. Maintains good relationships with state agencies. _____
9. Is knowledgeable about budget-making process. _____
10. Makes effort to keep board informed. _____
11. Is effective in securing capable employees. _____
12. Is knowledgeable about how college is funded. _____
13. Delegates responsibility to degree necessary. _____
14. Deals with people effectively. _____
15. His management style is democratic. (The other end of the scale would be autocratic.) _____
16. No matter where management style is rated, rate its effectiveness. (5 is best). _____
17. Maintains high academic and instructional standards by supporting administrators responsible. _____
18. Supports his employees in their jobs. _____
19. Is totally dedicated to his job. _____
20. Other significant characteristics: _____
    _____

Rating Scale for Community College Presidents
Designed by James L. Wattenbarger, W. Dean Evans and G.L. Mears

Chief Executive Evaluation Form

Directions: Listed below are statements concerning the actions, characteristics, qualities, etc. that may describe the president or chief executive officer of a college. To the right of each statement are two sets of columns. Check one column in the left hand set of columns to indicate how important the characteristic should be to the president of an *ideal college*. Then check in the right hand set of columns to indicate your estimate of how adequately the characteristic is carried out by the president of *this college*.

The President Strongly Supports...	Importance in an Ideal College			President's Performance at This College		
	Very Important (1)	Important (2)	Not Important (3)	Above Average (1)	Average (2)	Below Average (3)
1. The operation of continuing education classes at convenient times and locations for students.						
2. The attempts to secure governmental and other outside funding for college projects.						
3. The admission of non-typical persons such as older adults, handicapped persons, etc. as regular students.						
4. The maximum use of facilities by the offering of classes during the evenings and on weekends.						
5. Providing career education for all students.						
6. Long-range, college-wide planning.						
7. Counseling services for potential non-typical students such as adults interested in job retraining.						
8. Good faith bargaining with organized labor groups on campus.						

The President Strongly Supports...	Importance in an Ideal College			President's Performance at This College		
	Very Important (1)	Important (2)	Not Important (3)	Above Average (1)	Average (2)	Below Average (3)
9. Efforts to assure all employees a fair hearing if disciplinary action is initiated against them.	____	____	____	____	____	____
10. Efforts to develop good management skills among all levels of administrators.	____	____	____	____	____	____
11. Efforts to maintain adequate faculty staffing to provide quality education to all students.	____	____	____	____	____	____
12. The college-wide dissemination of reports of college-wide studies.	____	____	____	____	____	____
13. The operation of an effective job placement service for students and graduates.	____	____	____	____	____	____
14. The participation of all college groups in budget planning.	____	____	____	____	____	____
15. The efforts to recruit highly qualified faculty.	____	____	____	____	____	____
16. Efforts to involve all college groups in long-range planning.	____	____	____	____	____	____
17. Efforts to develop a sense of job security among faculty and supportive staff employees.	____	____	____	____	____	____
18. Efforts to streamline administrative procedures to cut "red-tape."	____	____	____	____	____	____
19. Faculty efforts to use innovative teaching techniques.	____	____	____	____	____	____
20. The efforts of college employees to make the mission of the college known to citizen groups in the total community.	____	____	____	____	____	____
21. The use of college facilities by community groups.	____	____	____	____	____	____

The President Strongly Supports...	Importance in an Ideal College			President's Performance at This College		
	Very Important (1)	Important (2)	Not Important (3)	Above Average (1)	Average (2)	Below Average (3)
22. The development and use of annual college-wide objectives.	____	____	____	____	____	____
23. The efforts of faculty members in producing instructional materials.	____	____	____	____	____	____
24. Close contacts with community business persons to determine ways the college can better prepare potential employees for these business firms.	____	____	____	____	____	____
25. The cultural affairs such as the theatre productions.	____	____	____	____	____	____
26. Equitable salary rates for all employees.	____	____	____	____	____	____
27. The procedures for the promotion of qualified faculty.	____	____	____	____	____	____
28. The use of developmental courses to enable students to overcome deficiencies in basic skills.	____	____	____	____	____	____
29. The continuing examination of the philosophy and purposes of the college.	____	____	____	____	____	____
30. Close working relations between college departments and county government departments.	____	____	____	____	____	____
31. Efforts to apply effective management techniques.	____	____	____	____	____	____
32. The procedures for the promotion of qualified supportive staff personnel.	____	____	____	____	____	____
33. The planning of changes in the college from within rather than having changes forced on the college by external agencies.	____	____	____	____	____	____

The President Strongly Supports...	Importance in an Ideal College			President's Performance at This College		
	Very Important (1)	Important (2)	Not Important (3)	Above Average (1)	Average (2)	Below Average (3)
34. The senior academic leaders in their efforts to assure that high academic standards are maintained.	____	____	____	____	____	____
35. The use of funds for projects that show promise but have a degree of risk.	____	____	____	____	____	____
36. Efforts to assure good communication among all members of the college community.	____	____	____	____	____	____
37. Efforts to develop innovative curricula to meet changing societal needs.	____	____	____	____	____	____
38. The use of all college resources such as the computer, test center, etc. by all faculty members.	____	____	____	____	____	____
39. The extensive use of institutional studies in decision making at the higher administrative levels.	____	____	____	____	____	____
40. The efforts of administrators to maintain high staff morale.	____	____	____	____	____	____
41. The efforts of groups such as the I.A.C. and the All-Council to provide an opportunity for all members of the college community to be represented in college governance.	____	____	____	____	____	____
42. Efforts to allow lower level administrators a high degree of freedom in carrying out the functions of their job.	____	____	____	____	____	____
43. The efforts to develop a sense of community and shared interests and purposes in the college.	____	____	____	____	____	____

The President Strongly Supports...	Importance in an Ideal College			President's Performance at This College		
	Very Important (1)	Important (2)	Not Important (3)	Above Average (1)	Average (2)	Below Average (3)
44. The right of all persons and groups to be heard in any discussion of college problems even though he may not agree with the particular viewpoint.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

In your opinion, what action(s) could the president of the college take that would improve the college:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____